

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1892.

I.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES IN RELATION TO HIS PERSONALITY.

BY THE REV. EML. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

THE person of our Lord conditions the peculiar elements of His ministry. Identified with the Adamic race suffering the miseries of sin, He is distinguished by love to the race, a love which characterizes His personal history from the beginning to the end. Righteous love is active in two ways: in what He does, and in what He says.

His doings and His sayings correspond to His personality. Jesus was what no man ever had been, He became what no man ever had become; therefore He did what no man had ever done, and He spake as no man had ever spoken.

Contrasted with the works done by other mighty men, His deeds were 'miracles'; contrasted with the doctrines taught by other great teachers, His words were 'spirit' and 'life.' His words and His deeds fit the Son of Man.

The conquests of Alexander answer to his military genius, the resources of his country and the bravery of his troops. So the conquests of Jesus over diseases, demoniacal possessions,

and over death, answer to the superior authority of His divine-human Personality. The philosophy of Plato answers to his metaphysical insight and powers of profound thought; so the new teaching of Jesus respecting God and man answers to the new consciousness of ideal manhood.

Moved by the love of fallen mankind to take the form of a servant and become obedient unto death, the Son of God became the Mediator that men might share the triumphant life which He lived and know the truth which He was.

The ministry of the Mediator was the impartation of His fulness to all classes who were capable of receiving His gifts.* The new blessings given by miracle and by parable presuppose the new spiritual resources which He developed and realized in Himself.

I.

The deeds of our Lord are to be studied, first, *in relation to Himself*, then *in relation to the persons and things* these deeds were wrought upon. In both relations His deeds, however wonderful, were *natural*. They were done in accord with His own nature, and in accord with the nature of men and of things.

The miracle which above all others appeals to faith and reason is His own personal history; yet this personal history is neither unhuman nor unnatural.

The extraordinariness of His personality as presented by the books of the New Testament we cannot but see and feel. Contrasted with all heroes of ancient and modern times, or with the best teachers of religion, He stands alone. Between Him and the noblest among pious men there is a deep, broad chasm.

Though Abraham and Moses, David, Samuel and Isaiah were chosen men of Jehovah who lived on a spiritual level far higher than any pagan seeker after God, yet no lawgiver, nor seer, nor prophet of the Old Testament furnishes a criterion of judgment. So far above them all does His personality tower that John Baptist, than whom there was none greater among them that

* Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." John 1: 16.

are born of women, pronounced himself not worthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of His shoes.*

A similar contrast is evident when we compare the Master with His disciples. Though he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John Baptist, yet the life of no apostle is the perfect image of the life of his Lord. John and James, Peter and Paul, are wonderful revelations of a new, an uplifting and transforming virtue, yet in point of moral character and divine consciousness they are of inferior rank. He is the pattern, they are reflections; He is without sin, they confess themselves sinners; He realizes the divine idea of man, they are the imperfect witnesses of Him; He is the fountain of a new vitality, a new righteousness, a new spiritual strength, they receive their inspiration with all their new powers from Him.

Reason cannot account for the character of Jesus, a Man who whilst living on the ordinary human plane, in sympathy with all the needs and all the woes of His fellow-men stands forth the reality of an ideal never before attempted or even conceived, by recognizing in Him only the best endowments of the Hebrew people. A life, a character so new, so extraordinary, so opposite to the accepted principles of the noblest men, presupposes an extraordinary personality. Jesus Christ is the one great Miracle of the Christian religion.

In the degree that we rise to a perception of the Miracle which His personal history sets before us, we may get an insight into the naturalness of His character and of His wonderful works. Does the ideal of any philosopher, pagan or Christian, satisfy the aspirations of the human reason? Does not every great man aim at a kind of perfection higher than that to which he has attained? Is any truly human ideal of character or of achievement, however exalted, irrational? Does not the age and the world support and commend the endeavor after extraordinary achievements for the well-being of mankind? Does not the man who accomplishes great things for

* Matt. 11: 11; Luke 7: 28; John 1: 27.

his age command enthusiastic approval? Does he not lose respect in the degree that he fails of a high aim?

When Jesus sets before Himself an ideal of love to God and love to man, of self-sacrifice for the salvation and blessedness of His enemies, an ideal which distinguishes Him above all great and good men, does not such a high purpose accord with the dictates of sound reason? Is such an ideal not truly in living sympathy with our purest aspirations? Does it not accord with the best elements of man's nature?

Inasmuch as Jesus proposes to Himself an aim which distinguishes Him from all other men, sound reason demands that He demonstrate His claim to respect and confidence by the realization of His aim. Did He or did He not succeed? There is no occasion for argument in support of an affirmative answer. That He was the extraordinary Reality which He proposed to Himself is conceded even by some of the most learned of His enemies. Is such reality natural or unnatural?

Is it unnatural to evolve an ideal of manhood purer, higher than the ideals of all other men? Is it unnatural to resolve that ideal into reality, and set it without flaw or blemish before the eyes of the world? Is it superhuman, or is it truly human, to touch the richest possibilities of man's divine imageship?

No; the personal life of Jesus was neither unhuman nor unnatural. The Miracle of miracles, whilst it reveals a Presence other than the laws of nature, other than the endowments of the Adamic race, is nevertheless in sympathy with the laws of nature and responsive to the dictates of sound reason.

II.

From a person who is Himself a miracle we look for miraculous deeds. From a man whose character is extraordinary we may expect extraordinary words. Reason asks for works and words that answer to personality.

Jesus Christ was pre-eminently the Man of deeds. He came into the world, not chiefly to teach new doctrines, but to *do* new

truth. His personality and His works were the presupposition of all His words.

His deeds done in the service of mankind are to be studied under a twofold aspect: in their relation to men as *men*, bearing God's image, capable of God's love; then also in their relation to man's *enemies*, including all the ills of his fallen condition.

Formed in God's image, men are by their creation predestinated for the perfect communion of love with God. They have a hidden intrinsic capacity to be wrought upon by the miraculous works done by Jesus. Their nature has a susceptibility akin to the capacities of His own human nature. His aim it was by doing the will of His Father to make Himself the archetype of a new manhood, a manhood of which the primeval man was the figure.* At every cost, opposed by the enmity of wicked men, assailed by Satan, Jesus persisted with unyielding firmness in the work of realizing and consummating the glory of *true* manhood.

By His works and His words He aimed to make all men what He was. The consummation set before Him by the Father for Himself was the consummation which He set for others; for in all men He recognizes the possibility of attaining in union with Himself, by the obedience of faith, to a manhood pure, perfectly righteous, divinely holy, like His own.

On the basis of this principle He forms a kingdom out of sinful men, changed by a new birth of the Spirit into likeness to Himself, a kingdom in which He reigns as King, a kingdom which differs from the kingdoms of the world as He differs from other kings. Says our Lord: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister, and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."†

*Rom. 5: 14.

† Mk. 10: 42-45; Matt. 20: 28.

The authority of His kingdom is the authority of love, not the love of a father to a son, nor of a patriot to his country, such as may be seen among the civilized nations of paganism, nor that purer love, examples of which appear in some of the best representatives of the Hebrew nation; but that self-sacrificing love for all men, for 'the evil and the good,' for 'the just and the unjust,'* in the service of God, of which Jesus is the beginning; the love which perceives in every man, every woman, every child, the inborn capability of God-like perfection, of a blessedness akin to the eternal blessedness of God; and therefore takes delight in consecrating time and strength, talent and genius, even life itself, to the work of raising the wicked from the 'horrible pit' of sin to the divine plane of righteousness and wisdom.†

Of His kingdom He is the only foundation; "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."† This foundation is laid in man's nature no less than decreed by God's sovereign will. Extraordinary as is the fundamental principle of His kingdom and the law by which His kingdom is governed; fierce as was the war waged against it by the enmity of the Jew and the Gentile, the kingdom is nevertheless in reality a natural kingdom. It was and it is just what the nature of the Adamic race needed, what nature yearned after, what it struggled by inventions of its own to establish, and what men by their natural endowments had a fitness to enter. There is no principle of the kingdom, no precept, no maxim, no ordinance, not even a word contrary to any law of mind or body. Instead, all the gifts of the kingdom and all its demands, demonstrate it to be the complement and the joy of genuine manhood.

Answering to the deepest needs of the nature of men, and aiming at their positive perfection, the works of Jesus were done in opposition to *sin*. From this alien principle moral evils and physical evils arise. The enemy of sin, Jesus waged war against sin; and He did His works for the destruction of

* Matt. 5: 45.

† Ps. 40: 2.

† 1 Cor. 3: 11.

the ills to which the sinful race is heir. Blindness, deafness, lameness, fevers, paralysis, leprosy, demoniacal possessions, death, and all the pains and sorrows attending these evils are contrary to human nature and to our natural instincts. Each is a violation of manhood, being inimical to the life of the body and the well-being of the soul. It is not forgiveness that violates the laws of nature, but transgression and guilt. It is not an effectual remedy, not miraculous interposition, that interrupts and suspends the harmonies of the family and the State, but sickness, diseases, death.

The miraculous healings recorded in the Gospels declare the superior authority of Jesus Christ to be in profoundest sympathy with man's nature; no less also with the nature of sub-human kingdoms. Jesus honors all natural laws. So far from violating, or suspending, or even for an instant disturbing the original equipoise of man's complex organization, or interrupting the harmony between man and lower kingdoms, every miraculous cure asserted the fundamental rights of humanity by attacking the abnormal principle from which the ills of life proceed, and by overwhelming the Adversary of the good and the right. The Author of nature honors nature. The Man who is the true ideal of manhood is the enemy, not of natural law, but of the transgression of natural law.

If we get a clear insight into the naturalness of the works of Jesus, into His devotion to the hidden truth of man, and to the harmony between man and lower kingdoms, the great number of wonderful cures* wrought by His touch or His word will appear to be like refreshing streams flowing from a new fountain of human vitality opened in the barren desert.

The Synoptists prove the historicity of their records by the very fact that they contain an account of these miracles. If

* Matthew says: And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people. And the report of Him went forth into all Syria; and they brought unto Him all that were sick, holden with divers diseases and torments, possessed with devils, and epileptic, and palsied; and He healed them.—4: 23, 24.

miracles were wanting in the record, their absence would indicate that in the actual history of Jesus they did not occur; and reasoning from the absence of miracles in His actual history, it would follow, either that His works did not correspond to the perfect naturalness of His personality, or that His personality did not in truth realize the ideal superiority of man over nature's ills. His personal history would have come short of genuine manhood, would as really have been wanting in naturalness as is the personal history of all other great men.

III.

Proceeding on the same general principle, we may form a correct judgment concerning other classes of our Lord's miraculous works. When Jesus walks upon the turbulent waves of the Sea of Galilee, or commands the storm to be still, and it obeys His word; or when He directed Peter to go to the sea, cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up to find a shekel in his mouth in order therewith to pay tribute; or says to the fruitless fig tree, Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward forever, and immediately the fig tree withered away, He asserts and declares the original superiority of man over the kingdoms of nature. Such extraordinary acts display the purpose of God in forming man after His own image.

Of the primeval family it is written: God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." Seizing the truth of Genesis, the eighth Psalm hymns the praises of Jehovah in the same lofty strain:

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that Thou visitest him?
For Thou hast made him but little lower than God,
And crownest him with glory and honor.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands.
Thou hast put all things under his feet.

When Jesus commands the angry sea we have a manifestation

of the true dignity of man as king of the natural world, a definite expression of the irresistible might with which man's will may put in subjection under his feet the disorganizing forces of lower realms. He simply fulfils the prophecies of the Old Testament.

On the same principle we interpret the miracle of feeding five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes. When they have all eaten and are filled, the disciples take up twelve basketfuls of the broken pieces. This extraordinary transaction accords with the *original* laws and the true teleology of nature. Jesus touches the hidden synthesis, on the one side, between impersonal nature and the will of its Author immanent in its laws, and on the other side He asserts the hidden synthesis of human personality with the economy of the lower world. Nature anticipates man, anticipates the ideal man. To be truly natural, to fulfil its mission, nature needs man's presence, needs the benediction of his personality to be active in it and upon it.

This principle is applicable to the miracle of Cana in Galilee. Jesus ordered six water-pots of stone to be filled with water, and when the servants obeyed His command, Draw out now, and bear to the ruler of the feast, the water became wine. The exertion of His miracle-working power was neither arbitrary, nor was He ambitious of vain display. There was a want of wine at the marriage. Our Lord interposes to supply this want. Here, as in other instances, an evil is impending; and the evil is one of the consequences of prevalent disorganization. His act of interposition reveals His kingship over nature. Agreeably to the word in Genesis, He, the ideal Man, has dominion 'over all the earth'; and the exercise of this dominion expresses in a figure the human design of His Presence. Nature is made for man, not man for nature. Nature is man's servant; and when by the force of His will Jesus turns water into wine in the service of man, He works after the method of the ideal Man, who has an intuitive perception of the relations of nature to His kingdom, neither seen nor

tangible by ordinary men. The miracle images the truth that His kingdom not only removes all actual evils, but at the same time also supplies all individual and social needs.* His kingdom is profitable for all things, having the promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come.

In performing the miracle in Cana He proves Himself to be equal to His claims. Does He not profess to have come to be the Saviour of the world? The salvation which He brings means deliverance from *all* evils, whether of body or soul, whether of the individual, or the family, or the state. Can any rational objection be made to such a salvation? Does not the judgment of men everywhere bear witness to two things: that such a comprehensive salvation is needed, and that such salvation can come neither from nature, nor from philosophy, nor natural science, nor culture, nor material progress? Universal judgment by implication affirms that if deliverance be possible, it must come from One who not only differs from ordinary men, but who also as regards wisdom and power is qualified at will to command all the forces of Good and of Evil, natural and spiritual.

Is it then rational to raise objections to the wonderful deeds of Christ because, claiming to be the Saviour of the world from all evils, He makes good His claim? or inasmuch as the methods of ordinary men are a universal failure He makes good His claim by methods of His own? Could Jesus do things that no men have ever done if His method did not differ from ordinary methods? Would not the absence of methods, and of results peculiar to Himself involve a reflection on the perfection of His character? If claiming to be the complete Saviour He should like other physicians stand powerless before leprosy, or should be dumb in the presence of the bier and the tomb, only weeping with those that weep, would not this lack of ability to afford extraordinary relief in an extraordinary emergency declare Him to be only a man like other men, not the mighty

* Seek ye first His kingdom, and His righteousness; and all other things shall be added unto you.—Matt. 6: 33.

Saviour, and declare His kingdom to be of this world, not the kingdom of God?

When Christology refers the authority with which Jesus rebukes the storm, and the power with which He multiplies the loaves and the fishes, or walks on the surface of the sea, exclusively to His divinity, it overlooks fundamental Christian truth. The Gospels lose one element of their peculiar significance, and the manhood of Jesus is divested of the unique dignity which the New Testament ascribes to Him. As affecting our judgment of Jesus it means nothing when Christology says that God can do all things, that God governs in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth. Christianity is not needed to teach us that. So much we learn even from the light of nature.* If Christianity means no more than this: that God can forgive sins: that God changes man's heart; that God can calm the turbulent waves; that God can give sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and the vigor of health to the leper;—if Christianity means no more, it is as to kind no advance on Judaism; it would only set forth more clearly, more definitely, what we learn from the Old Testament. If we accept no more, we lose sight of the virtue of the new principle, that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." This new principle as represented by the New Testament requires us to believe that the human nature of Jesus, because *truly human*, was even while on earth the adequate organ of His divine nature for the fulfilment of His mission in the state of humiliation. Like Himself, His wonderful works are divine-human, as really human as divine; and His works prove themselves to be divine by the fact that in fulfilment of the original idea of man they are truly human.

Of the transforming power of true manhood over lower kingdoms we have a prophecy in the arts of civilization. Art and science turn the desert into a garden, multiply the fertility of the soil, and bring to light secret possibilities of vegetable and animal life. What ordinary men accomplish through various inventions and instrumentalities, the Son of Man does by a

* Rom. 1: 20.

method of His own, the silent exercise of His righteous will. In all its realms, in all its laws, in its relations backward to God and forward to man, nature is responsive to His plastic touch, because human personality and impersonal nature are members of one system, nature being man's material foundation, and personality the apex and complement of nature.

To complete a Scriptural conception of our Lord's miracles it is needful to emphasize their *chief design*. All His works derive their meaning from their direct connection with the founding of His kingdom.

The type, the law and ultimate end of His kingdom is Himself. In it and by it the distinguishing qualities of His personality are to be realized. His own attitude toward God, His own attitude toward the Adamic race, toward nature and the kingdom of darkness is as to its purpose the attitude of His kingdom. As His person is superior to the disintegrating forces of the natural world; as no disease, no sickness could seize Him with its fatal grasp, nor death itself, which of His own will He suffered, could hold Him in subjection, so the kingdom founded on His person is intrinsically superior to all human ills. The healing of bodily and mental diseases, the raising of the dead and the removal of all kinds of human misery were the natural operation of the genius of His kingdom, on the one hand answering to the demands of human nature, and on the other prophetic of an intrinsic energy adequate to the entire emancipation of the race.

Wrought for the removal of moral and physical evils, the works of Jesus had at the same time a profound positive significance. His miracles were more than antidotes. Jesus laid hold of the normal order of human life, and the normal order of the natural world, the order which underlies disorganization and misery. He touched latent possibilities of soul and body, and developed these possibilities into realities. Discerning and asserting the original purpose and the ideal development of humanity, He overcame evils by a quickening and recuperative force active from within. Deafness, blindness, lameness, paraly-

sis He heals by reviving the suppressed vitality of the subject, thus honoring and enthroning the rights of original laws. As a physician overcomes sickness by protecting or stimulating the natural vitality of his patient, so the Great Physician by the force of His penetrating will quickens the capacities of suffering men, capacities unknown and inaccessible to ordinary medical skill; by vivifying and unfolding slumbering powers He neutralizes and abolishes the poison of moral and physical evil.

Two things He does for suffering mankind by one act: the one removing the external phenomena of mental and bodily diseases, the other destroying the cause of these phenomena lodged in the interior constitution. All who are accessible to His spiritual power of healing are not only delivered from external ills, but they are also lifted up to a nobler plane of life on which they move with new vigor, new strength, new hope.

IV.

The words and the deeds of Jesus Christ are integral parts of the one ministry. Miracles are truth confronting us in the character of transactions. Words are deeds wrought out in language. As the statue is poetry in marble, so the parable is life-giving might in articulate speech.

Deeds and words are expressions of the same personality. Each is the medium through which His life and salvation are freely imparted to men dead in sin and subject to the curse of violated law. Of the two modes of ministration, the deed, the transaction, is the richer manifestation, because under the form of reality it embodies and reveals more of the wealth of His personality.

This proposition is valid respecting the objective history of Jesus Christ as compared with the record of Him in the words of either of the four Gospels. The fact of His miraculous conception and birth has more virtue and meaning than the account written by Matthew and Luke can express. So in regard to the crucifixion and resurrection. The reality of His death is fundamental; it has more solemn significance than the words

of Jesus foretelling it bring to light, or than the words of the apostles who bear witness to the fact can teach. As regards the resurrection, no words of Scripture furnish us an adequate insight into its nature. The mystery of the crucifixion and the resurrection we approach in the Spirit by faith; and unquestionably we have to study each through the agency of the inspired record. But the principal Object of our faith, the ground of our undying hope, is the Reality from which evangelical speech derives its unfathomable meaning.

Of like kind is the relation of the words spoken by Jesus Christ to the fundamental Miracle, to His Personality and His personal history on earth and in heaven. Inasmuch as He was a Man such as no one had been before, such as no one has been since, He spake as no one has ever spoken. The Truth which He was and which He lived was a breadth and length, a height and depth, which by the common consent of Christendom no believer, no theologian, has yet measured. For this reason the words of Jesus as written by the evangelists presuppose an import, a hidden wealth of virtue, which the mind of the evangelists did not fathom,—a wealth which by the Christian may be more and more clearly discerned as by the Holy Spirit He grows in positive fellowship with the life of Christ. Communion in the Spirit with Christ Himself conditions better insight into the import of evangelical words.

The lack of a distinct recognition of the relation which the personality and the deeds of our Lord bear to His words has betrayed some scholars into a partial undervaluing of the Synoptists. A sentiment has been gaining currency which, by overlooking the peculiar worth of Matthew, Mark and Luke, extols the Fourth Gospel disproportionately, extols it because, whilst recording but few miracles, it contains, with the exception of the Sermon on the Mount, the richest discourses of our Lord. Negative criticism attacks the Gospel of John because of these profound discourses, and attacks the Synoptists on account of the many miracles which they record. Apologetics

has proceeded largely on the silent assumption that the Fourth Gospel is the principal book. Corresponding to this silent assumption that the discourses of our Lord are the fundamentals of Christianity, not a few learned men have felt called upon to apologize for the many miracles of the Synoptists, even to explain away the historicity of some of them by denying or questioning the reality of demoniacal possessions.

Such hesitancy of faith, such an unwarranted concession to the enemy is as unphilosophical as it is unbiblical. The order of arrangement of the four Gospels is logical no less than historical. First the person of the Son of Man, then His discourses. First His wonderful deeds, then His wonderful words. Rightly judged the three synoptists condition the Fourth Gospel. All move on the same high divine-human plane; but if there be any difference Matthew, Mark and Luke are, objectively considered, more profound and of richer import. Instead of feeling any need of apologizing for the numerous miracles recorded by the Synoptists, or of investing the record with more credibility by referring demoniacal possessions to the superstition of the age, a sound Christology ought to rely on the truth of the principle that the miracles answer to the personality of the Man. The Man who has a consciousness of possessing godlike life and transcendent authority, who has the amazing courage to lay claim to a dignity superior to all other men, such dignity as the inimitable discourses recorded by John necessarily presuppose, must either be unworthy of confidence and respect, or He must have had the will and the power to perform the miracles reported by the Synoptists. Accept the reality of the miracles of Mark, and there is a logical basis for the discourses of John. Deny the miracles of Mark and the legitimate reflex action of thought will deny the extraordinary personality of Jesus. Deny His extraordinary personality, and the discourses of John will have to be resolved into the vagaries of a morbid phantasy.

To state the same principle in other words: if no mighty deeds had been recorded by the Synoptists, if the ills of the

kingdom of darkness had not receded at His touch, if the incarnate Presence of God in ideal manhood had not provoked an unprecedented manifestation of demoniacal enmity, there would have been a contradiction between His words and His doings, between His self-exaltation in speech and His helpless inefficiency in practice.

For the sake of the argument I have impliedly been acceding to the presumption that the teaching of Christ as represented in John differs in kind from His teaching as reported by the Synoptists. But truth requires Christology to challenge this presumption. Is it valid? There is good reason to question its validity. The subject matter of the teaching is the same in all the Gospels. The variation is seen in the method. In John there is little or no teaching by parables; instead we have metaphor; in the other Gospels parables abound. Two methods of teaching represent different aspects of our Lord's genius. The parables of the Synoptists declare His artistic skill, whilst the discourses of John show His philosophic wealth.

Parables are works of art, the word-paintings of the ideal Artist. The subjects are Himself and His kingdom. The classic pictures of Matthew, Mark and Luke, like the noblest works of all great artists, are a perpetual inspiration to the heart of the Christian, and to the scholarly theologian objects of study from age to age.

By deeds and by words, by miracle and by parable Jesus Christ imparts to receptive souls of the fulness of His life and salvation. Men become rich, strong, godlike, and triumph over evil in proportion that by the obedience of faith they accept and appropriate His ministrations.

II.

CALVIN AT HOME.

BY REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

CALVIN expresses his views on marriage in his comments on Ephesians 5: 28-33. "It is a thing against nature," he remarks, "that any one should not love his wife, for God has ordained marriage in order that two may be made one person—a result which, certainly, no other alliance can bring about. When Moses says that a man shall leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife, he shows that a man ought to prefer marriage to every other union, as being the holiest of all."

He himself was in no hurry to get married, and put it off till he was over thirty. He rather boasted that people could not charge him with having assailed Rome, as the Greeks besieged Troy, for the sake of a woman. What led him first to think of it, was the sense of loneliness and the need of proper care, that he might be able the better to serve the Church. While living at Strassburg, between 1539 and 1541, he had a housekeeper, with her son, a woman of violent temper who sorely tried his patience. At one time she abused his brother so violently that he left the house, and then she ran away, leaving her son behind. The disturbance made him sick.

He was often urged by his friend Farel (who himself found no time to think of marrying till his old age,) and by Bucer at Strassburg, to take a wife that he might enjoy the comforts of a well-ordered home. He first mentions the subject in a letter to Farel, from Strassburg, May 19, 1539, in which he says: "I am none of those insane lovers who, when once smitten with the fine figure of a woman, embrace also her faults. This only is

the beauty which allures me, if she is chaste, obliging, not fastidious, economical, patient, and careful for my health. Therefore, if you think well of it, set out immediately, lest some one else [Bucer?] gets the start of you. But if you think otherwise, we will let it pass." It seems Farel could not find a person that combined all these qualities, and the matter was dropped for several months.

In Feb. 6, 1540, Calvin, in a letter to the same friend, touched again upon the subject of matrimony, but only incidentally, as if it were a subordinate matter. After informing him about his trouble with Caroli, his discussion with Hermann, the Anabaptist, the good understanding of Charles V. and Francis I., and the alarm of the Protestant princes of Germany, he goes on to say: "Nevertheless, in the midst of such commotions as these, I am so much at my ease as to have the audacity to think of taking a wife. A certain damsel of noble rank has been proposed to me, and with a fortune above my condition. Two considerations deterred me from that connection—because she did not understand our language, and because I feared she might be too mindful of her family and education." *

He sent his brother for another lady, who was highly recommended to him. He expected to get married March 10, and invited Farel to celebrate the wedding. But this project also failed, and he thought of abandoning all further attempts.

At last he married a member of his congregation, at Strassburg, Idelette de Bure, the widow of Jean Stordeur (or Storder) of Liège, a prominent Anabaptist whom he had converted to the orthodox faith, and who had died of the pestilence in the previous February. She was probably the daughter of Lambert de Bure who, with his fellow-citizens, had been deprived of his property and banished forever, after having been legally convicted of heresy in 1533. She was the mother of several children, poor, and in feeble health. She lived in retirement, devoted to the education of her children, and enjoyed the esteem of her friends, for her good qualities of head and heart. Calvin visited her frequently

* *Herdinjad*, VI. 167 sq.

as pastor, and was attracted by her quiet, modest, gentle character. He found in her what he desired—firm faith, devoted love and domestic helpfulness. He calls her "the excellent companion of my life," "the ever-faithful assistant of my ministry," and a "rare woman." Beza calls her "a grave and honorable lady."

Calvin lived in happy wedlock, but only for nine years. His wife was taken from him at Geneva, after a protracted illness, early in April, 1549. He felt the loss very deeply, and found comfort only in his work. He turned from the coffin to his study-table, and resumed the duties of his office with quiet resignation and conscientious fidelity as if nothing had happened. He remained a widower the remaining fifteen years of his life.

We know much less of Calvin's domestic life than of Luther's. He was always reticent concerning himself and his private affairs, while Luther was very frank and demonstrative. In selecting their wives neither of the Reformers had any regard to the charms of beauty and wealth which attract most lovers, nor even to intellectual endowment; they looked only to moral worth and domestic virtue. Luther married at the age of forty-one, Calvin at the age of thirty-one. Luther married a Catholic ex-nun, after having vainly recommended her to his friend Amsdorf, whom she proudly refused, looking to higher distinction. He married her under a sudden impulse in the midst of the disturbances of the Peasants' War, to the consternation of his friends, that he might please his father, tease the pope, and vex the devil. Calvin married, like Zwingli, a Protestant widow with several children; he married from esteem rather than impulse, after due reflection and the solicitation of friends.

Kathe Luther cuts a prominent figure in her husband's personal history and correspondence, and survived him several years, which she spent in poverty and affliction.

Idelotte de Bure lived in modest retirement, and died in peace fifteen years before Calvin. Luther submitted as "a willing servant" to the rule of his "Lord Kathe," but loved

her dearly, played with his children in childlike simplicity, addressed to her his last letters, and expressed his estimate of domestic happiness in the beautiful sentence: "The greatest gift of God to man is a pious, kindly, God-fearing, domestic wife."

Luther's domestic life was enlivened by quaint humor, poetry, and song; Calvin's was sober, quiet, controlled by the fear of God, and regulated by a sense of duty, but none the less happy. Nothing can be more unjust than the charge that Calvin was cold and unsympathetic. His whole correspondence proves the reverse. His letters on the death of his wife to his dearest friends reveal a deep fountain of tenderness and affection.

To Farel he wrote, April 2, 1549:—

"Intelligence of my wife's death has perhaps reached you before now. I do what I can to keep myself from being overwhelmed with grief. My friends also leave nothing undone that may administer relief to my mental suffering. When your brother left, her life was all but despaired of. When the brethren were assembled on Tuesday, they thought it best that we should join together in prayer. This was done. When Abel, in the name of the rest, exhorted her to faith and patience, she briefly (for she was now greatly worn) stated her frame of mind. I afterwards added an exhortation, which seemed to me appropriate to the occasion. And then, as she had made no allusion to her children, I, fearing that, restrained by modesty, she might be feeling an anxiety concerning them, which would cause her greater suffering than the disease itself, declared in the presence of the brethren that I should henceforth care for them as if they were my own. She replied, 'I have already committed them to the Lord.' When I replied that that was not to hinder me from doing my duty, she immediately answered, 'If the Lord shall care for them, I know they will be commended to you.' Her magnanimity was so great, that she seemed to have already left the world. About the sixth hour of the day on which she yielded up her soul to the Lord, our brother Bourgouin addressed some pious words to her, and while he was doing so, she spoke aloud, so that all saw that her heart was raised far above the world. For these were her words: 'O glorious resurrection! O God of Abraham and of all our fathers, in thee have the faithful trusted during so many past ages, and none of them have trusted in vain. I also will hope.' These short sentences were rather ejaculated than distinctly spoken. This did not come from the suggestion of others, but from her own reflections, so that she made it obvious in few words what were her own meditations. I had to go out at six o'clock. Having been removed to another apartment after seven, she immediately began to decline.

When she felt her voice suddenly failing her, she said, 'Let us pray; let us pray. All pray for me.' I had now returned. She was unable to speak, and her mind seemed to be troubled. I, having spoken a few words about the love of Christ, the hope of eternal life, concerning our married life, and her departure, engaged in prayer. In full possession of her mind, she both heard the prayer and attended to it. Before eight she expired, so calmly that those present could scarcely distinguish between her life and her death. I at present control my sorrow, so that my duties may not be interfered with. But in the meanwhile the Lord has sent other trials upon me. Adieu, brother and very excellent friend. May the Lord Jesus strengthen you by His Spirit; and may He support me also under this heavy affliction, which would certainly have overcome me, had not He, who raises up the prostrate, strengthens the weak, and refreshes the weary, stretched forth His hand from heaven to me. Salute all the brethren and your whole family."

To Viret he wrote a few days later, April 7, 1549, as follows:

"Although the death of my wife has been exceedingly painful to me, yet I subdue my grief as well as I can. Friends also are earnest in their duty to me. It might be wished, indeed, that they could profit me and themselves more; yet one can scarcely say how much I am supported by their attentions. But you know well enough how tender, or rather soft, my mind is. Had not a powerful self-control, therefore, been vouchsafed to me, I could not have borne up so long. And truly mine is no common source of grief. I have been bereaved of *the best companion of my life*, of one who, had it been so ordered, would not only have been the willing sharer of my indigence, but even of my death. During her life she was *the faithful helper of my ministry*. From her I never experienced the slightest hindrance. She was never troublesome to me throughout the entire course of her illness; she was more anxious about her children than about herself. As I feared these private cares might annoy her to no purpose, I took occasion, on the third day before her death, to mention that I would not fail in discharging my duty to her children. Taking up the matter immediately, she said, 'I have already committed them to God.' When I said that that was not to prevent me from caring for them, she replied, 'I know you will not neglect what you know has been committed to God.' Lately, also, when a certain woman insisted that she should talk with me regarding these matters, I, for the first time, heard her give the following brief answer: 'Assuredly the principal thing is that they live a pious and holy life. My husband is not to be urged to instruct them in religious knowledge and in the fear of God. If they be pious, I am sure he will gladly be a father to them; but if not, they do not deserve that I should ask for aught in their behalf.' This nobleness of mind will weigh more with me than a hundred recommendations. Many thanks for your friendly consolation. Adieu, most excellent and honest brother. May the Lord Jesus watch over and direct yourself and your wife. Present my best wishes to her and to the brethren."

In reply to this letter, Viret wrote to Calvin, April 10, 1549:

"Wonderfully and incredibly have I been refreshed, not by empty rumors alone, but especially by numerous messengers who have informed me how you, with a heart so broken and lacerated, have attended to all your duties even better than hitherto, . . . and that, above all, at a time when grief was so fresh, and on that account all the more severe, might have prostrated your mind. Go on then as you have begun, . . . and I pray God most earnestly that you may be enabled to do so, and that you may receive daily greater comfort, and be strengthened more and more."

Calvin's character shines in the same favorable light at the loss of his son, who died in infancy (1542). He thanked Viret and his wife (he always sends greetings to Viret's wife and daughter) for their tender sympathy with him in this bereavement, stating that Idelette would write herself also, but for her grief. "The Lord," he says, "has dealt us a severe blow in taking from us our son; but it is our Father who knows what is best for His children."* He found compensation for his want of offspring in the multitude of his spiritual children. "God has given me a little son, and taken him away, but I have myriads of children in the whole Christian world."

How deeply Calvin sympathized with his friends in domestic affliction, we have a most striking testimony in a private letter which was never intended for publication. It is the best proof of his extraordinary fidelity as a pastor. While he was in attendance at the Colloquy and Diet in Ratisbon, as a delegate from Strassbourg, the pestilence carried away, among other friends, Louis de Richebourg, who, together with his older brother, Claude, lived in his house at Strassburg as a student and *pensionnaire*, under the tutorship of Claude Féray, Calvin's dearly beloved assistant. On hearing the sad intelligence, early in April, 1541, he wrote to his father—a gentleman from Normandy, probably the lord of the village de Richebourg, between Rouen and Beauvais, but otherwise un-

* Aug. 19, 1542, at the close. *Opera*, XI., 430.

known to us—a long letter of condolence and comfort, from which we give the following extracts : * —

"RATISBON, (Month of April,) 1541.

"When I first received the intelligence of the death of Claude, and of your son Louis, I was so utterly overpowered (*tout esparvé et confus en mon esprit*) that for many days I was fit for nothing but to weep; and although I was somehow upheld before the Lord by those aids wherewith He sustains our souls in affliction among men, however, I was almost a nonentity; so far at least as regards my discharge of duty, I appeared to myself quite as unfit for it as if I had been half dead (*un homme demi-mort*). On the one hand, I was sadly grieved that a most excellent and faithful friend [Claude Féray] had been snatched away from me—a friend with whom I was so familiar, that none could be more closely united than we were; on the other hand, there arose another cause of grief, when I saw the young man, your son, taken away in the very flower of his age, a youth of most excellent promise, whom I loved as a son, because, on his part, he showed that respectful affection towards me as he would to another father.

"To this grievous sorrow was still added the heavy and distressing anxiety we experienced about those whom the Lord had spared to us. I heard that the whole household were scattered here and there. The danger of Malherbe caused me very great misery, as well as the cause of it, and warned me also as to the rest. I considered that it could not be otherwise but that my wife must be very much dismayed. Your Charles,† I assure you, was continually recurring to my thoughts; for in proportion as he was endowed with that goodness of disposition which had always appeared in him towards his brother, as well as his preceptor, it never occurred to me to doubt but that he would be steeped in sorrow and soaked in tears. One single consideration somewhat relieved me, that he had my brother along with him, who, I hoped, would prove no small comfort in this calamity; even that, however, I could not reckon upon, when, at the same time, I recollected that both were in jeopardy, and neither of them were yet beyond the reach of danger. Thus, until the letter arrived which informed me that Malherbe was out of danger, and that Charles, my brother, wife, and the others were safe, I would have been all but utterly cast down, unless, as I have already mentioned, my heart was refreshed in prayer and private meditations, which are suggested by His Word . . .

"The son whom the Lord had lent you for a season He has taken away.

* The letter was written in French and translated into Latin by Bess in his edition of *Calvini Epistolæ*, Geneva, 1575, p. 280 (under the wrong date of 1540). See *Opera*, XI. 188 sqq.; Herminjard, VII. 66-73; Bonnet-Constable, I. 222-229. I have used Constable's translation after comparing it with the French original. The concluding part, however, is only extant in Bess's Latin version.

† The older son of M. de Richebourg.

There is no ground, therefore, for those silly and wicked complaints of foolish men: O blind death! O hard fate! O implacable daughters of Destiny! O cruel fortune! The Lord who had lodged him here for a season, at this stage of his career has called him away. What the Lord has done, we must, at the same time, consider has not been done rashly, nor by chance, neither from having been impelled from without, but by that determinate counsel, whereby He not only foresees, decrees, and executes nothing but what is just and upright in itself, but also nothing but what is good and wholesome for us. Where justice and good judgment reign paramount, where it is impious to remonstrate, when, however, our advantage is bound up in that goodness, how great would be the degree of ingratitude not to acquiesce, with a calm and well-ordered temper of mind, in whatever is the wish of our Father . . .

"It is God who has sought back from you your son, whom He had committed to you to be educated, on the condition that he might always be His own. And, therefore, He took him away because it was both of advantage to him to leave this world, and by this bereavement to humble you, or to make trial of your patience. If you do not understand the advantage of this, without delay, first of all, setting aside every other object of consideration, ask of God that He may show you. Should it be His will to exercise you still farther, by concealing it from you, submit to that will, that you may become wiser than the weakness of thine own understanding can ever attain to. In what regards your son, if you bethink yourself how difficult it is, in this most deplorable age, to maintain an upright course through life, you will judge him to be blessed, who, before encountering so many coming dangers which already were hovering over him, and to be encountered in his day and generation, was so early delivered from them all. He is like one who has set sail upon a stormy and tempestuous sea, and before he has been carried out into the deeps, gets in safety to the secure haven. Nor, indeed, is long life to be reckoned so great a benefit of God, that we can lose anything, when separated only for the space of a few years, we are introduced to a life which is far better. Now, certainly, because the Lord Himself, who is the Father of us all, had willed that Louis should be put among the children as a son of His adoption, He bestows this benefit upon you, out of the multitude of His mercies, that you might reap the excellent fruit of your careful education before his death; whence also you might know your interest in the blessings that belonged to you, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.'

"From his earliest boyhood, so far as his years allowed, Louis was grounded in the best studies, and had already made such a competent proficiency and progress, that we entertained great hope of him for the future. His manners and behavior had met with the approval of all good men. If at any time he fell into error, he not only patiently suffered the word of admonition, but also that of reproof, and proved himself teachable and obedient, and willing to hearken to advice . . . That, however, which we rate most highly in him was, that he had imbibed so largely the principles of piety, that he had not merely

a correct and true understanding of religion, but had also been faithfully imbued with the unfeigned fear and reverence of God.

"This exceeding kindness of God toward your offspring ought with good reason to prevail more effectually with you in soothing the bitterness of death, than death itself have power to inflict grief upon you.

"With reference to my own feelings, if your sons had never come hither at all, I should never have been grieved on account of the death of Claude and Louis. Never, however, shall this most crushing sorrow, which I suffer on account of both, so overcome me, as to reflect with grief upon that day on which they were driven hither by the hand of God to us, rather than led by any settled purpose of their own, when that friendship commenced which has not only continued undiminished to the last, but which, from day to day, was rather increased and confirmed. Whatever, therefore, may have been the kind or model of education they were in search of, I rejoice that they lived under the same roof with me. And since it was appointed them to die, I rejoice also that they died under my roof, where they rendered back their souls to God more composedly, and in greater circumstance of quiet, than if they had happened to die in those places where they would have experienced greater annoyance from the importunity of those by whom they ought to have been assisted, than from death itself. On the contrary, it was in the midst of pious exhortations, and while calling upon the name of the Lord, that these sainted spirits fled from the communion of their brethren here to the bosom of Christ. Nor would I desire now to be free from all sorrow at the cost of never having known them. Their memory will ever be sacred to me to the end of my days, and I am persuaded that it will also be sweet and comforting.

"But what advantage, you will say, is it to me to have had a son of so much promise, since he has been torn away from me in the first flower of his youth? As if, forsooth, Christ had not merited, by His death, the supreme dominion over the living and the dead! And if we belong to Him (as we ought), why may He not exercise over us the power of life and of death? However brief, therefore, either in your opinion or in mine, the life of your son may have been, it ought to satisfy us that he has finished the course which the Lord had marked out for him.

"Moreover, we may not reckon him to have perished in the flower of his age, who had grown ripe in the sight of the Lord. For I consider all to have arrived at maturity who are summoned away by death; unless, perhaps, one would contend with Him, as if He can snatch away any one before his time. This, indeed, holds true of every one; but in regard to Louis, it is yet more certain on another and more peculiar ground. For he had arrived at that age, when, by true evidence, he could prove himself a member of the body of Christ: having put forth this fruit, he was taken from us and transplanted. Yes, instead of this transient and vanishing shadow of life, he has regained the real immortality of being.

"Nor can you consider yourself to have lost him, whom you will recover in the blessed resurrection in the kingdom of God. For they had both so lived

and so died, that I cannot doubt but they are now with the Lord. Let us, therefore, press forward toward this goal which they have reached. There can be no doubt but that Christ will bind together both them and us in the same inseparable society, in that incomparable participation of His own glory. Beware, therefore, that you do not lament your son as lost, whom you acknowledge to be preserved by the Lord, that he may remain yours forever, who, at the pleasure of His own will, lent him to you only for a season . . .

"Neither do I insist upon your laying aside all grief. Nor, in the school of Christ, do we learn any such philosophy as requires us to put off that common humanity with which God has endowed us, that, being men, we should be turned into stones. These considerations reach only so far as this, that you do set bounds, and, as it were, temper even your most reasonable sadness; that, having shed those tears which were due to nature and to fatherly affection, you by no means give way to senseless wailing. Nor do I by any means interfere because I am distrustful of your prudence, firmness, or high-mindedness; but only lest I might here be wanting, and come short in my duty to you.

"Moreover, I have requested Melancthon and Bucer that they would also add their letters to mine, because I entertained the hope that it would not be unacceptable that they too should afford some evidence of their good-will toward you.

"Adieu, most distinguished sir, and my much-respected in the Lord. May Christ the Lord keep you and your family, and direct you all with His own Spirit, until you may arrive where Louis and Claude have gone before."

III.

DID CHRIST SUFFER IN HIS DIVINE NATURE?

BY REV. CORNELIUS R. LANE, D.D., PH.D.

ACCORDING to the Scriptures, the Work of Redemption is God's greatest work. It makes manifest as much power and wisdom as the Work of Creation, and more goodness, that is, love more abounding and more intense, sterner justice and such condescension and forbearance as are simply impossible in a system in which no sin is found.

Of this greatest divine work, we, in common with all intelligent creatures, ought to learn all that can be known; and as distinguished from all others, we ought to study it more than they, because we are the direct objects of the benefits which the work confers.

But upon the very threshold of the investigation we are met by an inscrutable mystery, the doctrine of the Incarnation.

This doctrine is a mystery, not merely as a secret unknown until revealed; but also in the sense that the fact itself, when revealed, is beyond the power of any creature to understand. It must therefore be received on the ground of testimony external to the fact itself and apart from the nature of the thing in itself considered. All that can be done therefore is to consider, on the one hand, what the Scriptures teach as to what the doctrine is; and on the other, what relations, Scriptural and rational, it sustains to the scheme of Redemption.

One of these relations, it is proposed to examine, namely, the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of David, in satisfaction of the claims of the Divine Law binding on sinners of our race. In order to definiteness of discussion,

this will be done by way of considering and attempting to answer the question :

Did the Lord Jesus Christ suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of that offering which He made of Himself for our sins?

As preliminary to the discussion of the specific points presented, and in some measure to prepare the way for it, it is to be remarked in the first place and in general, that the passibility of the Divine nature is improbable for the reason,

I. That it is opposed to all our conceptions of God as a perfect being—perfect, that is, not merely in kind, as the elect angels are perfect, but absolutely, without possibility either of improvement or of deterioration.

1st. God, viewed in contrast with creatures, is perfect as to time, that is, He is eternal. With Him there is no past and no future; but all is what we call present. With Him therefore there can be no waiting, that is, no longing for any future good and no dread of any future evil.

2d. As to place, that is, as to what we call place, God is everywhere in the same sense at the same time, that is, God is immense, and therefore, with Him, there is no motion, no going or coming to or from one place to another. Anything, therefore, that affects us painfully or even unpleasantly in the way of desire for the presence of persons or things absent can have no place with Him. As to God, therefore, from the source of locality there can be no suffering.

3d. God is perfect as to knowledge, that is, He is omniscient. He can, therefore, make no mistakes, and therefore He can feel no regret for anything He has done or omitted in what as to us is the past, and entertain no uncertainty or apprehension as to the future.

4th. God's power is perfect; it inheres in an efficient will and therefore its exercise is independent of the use of means; and therefore externally it is irresistible, and limited internally only by His own good pleasure.

This attribute, therefore, takes away the ground of everything

painful viewed as arising from any danger of failure in accomplishing His purposes.

5th. God is just—righteous in all His ways; and therefore upon a review, as men say, of what He has done, there can be no self-condemnation.

These specifications are enough, on the one hand, to show that it is highly improbable that a perfect can be in any way a suffering being. They show, as far as the facts known can show, that God, speaking after the way of human analogy, is secured as to His blessedness and defended from every possible form of dissatisfaction with Himself or with anything He has done.

On the other hand, the very same considerations also exclude from the Divine mind all those affections pertaining to creatures, which are painful in their nature, yet beneficial in their tendency; the pain of amputation, for example, which is gladly endured in order to preserve life.

In all such cases, the suffering is in order to a greater good. But God has every good He can have. As to Him, therefore, there can be no improvement either in His nature, His condition or His circumstances.

If, at this point, the existence of sin is suggested as an objection, it is allowable also to suggest that the existence of sin, viewed as a source of misery, presses with equal weight upon the Divine benevolence, which delights in the happiness of creatures, and upon the Divine power, which could have prevented the existence of sin. For if God could not have prevented the existence of sin, then, being benevolent on the one hand, and being, on the other, by the supposition imperfect as to His power, at least in the sense of defective, God must be miserable in contemplating the misery which He could not prevent; and both He and we may well be apprehensive lest all His promises come to naught. For if the Divine power is such that, in spite of it, sin has entered in once, it is certainly possible for it to enter again and again, and for Deluge after Deluge of sin and misery to devastate God's Universe as the cycles of everlasting ages roll on.

II. If God can suffer, He must be miserable, at least, in the way of apprehension. If He does suffer, He is miserable; and if miserable to any extent, He can be to the greatest possible extent, miserable not occasionally, for He does not live in time, but miserable always and unchangeably, for He is Eternal; miserable in proportion to His infinite goodness manifested in Nature by His benevolence and in Redemption by His grace, that is, if God can be miserable to any degree, He can be, and as far as finite knowledge can discern, He must be miserable to an infinite degree. God's very greatness, therefore, is a source of greater misery, unless it be so great that it excludes all misery, on the one hand, and on the other, secures all blessedness. God, therefore, must be to His intelligent creatures either an object of unbounded confidence or a being to be commiserated. Between these extremes there does not appear to be any resting-place.

III. The language of the Scriptures, which attributes to God grief, Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, Ps. 95: 10, and repentance, Gen. 6: 5-7, must be interpreted in some way that is consistent with the Divine perfections as presented in other passages; and, if this cannot be done, then the Scriptures teach that God is local; Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, Gen. 4: 16, and consequently moves from place to place. The Lord went his way, Gen. 18: 33, ignorant, Ps. 14: 2, uncertain, Ex. 13: 17, and perplexed, What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Isa. 5: 4.

But the conclusion that God is local, ignorant, uncertain and perplexed cannot be admitted, unless His Omnipresence, Omniscience and Eternity be denied; for He cannot be both Omnipresent and local, Omniscient and ignorant, Eternal and yet waiting on the acts of His creatures to determine the course of His own conduct: but any principle of interpretation which involves a contradiction within the limits of our knowledge must be given up; or the Scriptures themselves as claiming to be a Divine revelation must be rejected.

These general remarks in regard to God as He is revealed to us in ourselves, in external Nature and in the Scriptures have, it is hoped, somewhat prepared the way for the examination, in the Second place, of the particular point proposed, namely, Did the Lord Jesus Christ suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of that offering which He made of Himself as a satisfaction to Divine justice for our sins?

Answering this Question in the negative, the First (I.) argument is that the proposition, The Lord Jesus Christ did suffer in His Divine nature in and as a part of His work of Redemption is unscriptural.

For, 1st. It is not necessary to a consistent interpretation of what the Scriptures teach in regard to the work of Christ.

Here it must be admitted that the Scriptures use language in regard to Christ which, at first sight, appears to be confused and even contradictory. He is spoken of as a child and at the same time as the mighty God; as the Creator and Preserver of all things and yet hungry, weary, houseless; as dying through weakness and yet at the same time the Object of that faith which secures everlasting life.

After long and sharp controversy, the Church has settled down into the belief, not likely to be disturbed, that the Lord Jesus Christ, being the Eternal Son of God, became man by taking to Himself a true, that is, a real body and a reasonable soul; and that He is and will continue to be both God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever: and, that all apparent confusion and contradiction can be removed and is in fact removed upon the principle, that, Whatever may be affirmed of either nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, may be affirmed of the whole person regardless of the aspect from which the person is designated. Hence we may say, The Son of God was made under the law, for it is true of Christ's human nature; and that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sin, for it is true of His Divine nature: and also that the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost, which is not true of either nature taken separately, but is true of both united.

This principle of Interpretation, if it be admitted takes away all necessity for holding that the Divine nature suffered; and if it be rejected, then it must indeed be admitted.

2d. That the Scriptures teach the suffering of the Divine nature, when they say, The Lord of glory was crucified; and then they also teach

(1) That the Son of God is a dependent being: I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which has sent me.

I can of mine own self do nothing—I, the whole person, whatever were its properties, relations or prerogatives, the entity then speaking, is inherently powerless; depends on hearing for information; and judges justly, not by that certainty which comes of Omniscience but because He is without selfish bias as to the will of the Father who sent Him.

(2) Upon this supposition, the Scriptures teach that the Son, taken absolutely without regard to the distinction of Son of God and Son of David—the Son did not know when the events foretold by Himself as certain would become actual. For the time was known neither to men, nor to angels, nor to the Son, but to the Father only. Here is ignorance both actual and confessed.

(3) If the Scriptures teach that the Divine nature of Christ suffered; then they also teach that His human nature was deified. For (a) when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. Here either the Son of man is Divine; or, a creature is exercising Divine prerogatives by performing a Divine work.

(b) It is admitted on both sides that the Son of David is also the Son of God, that is, according to the principle of Interpretation already referred to, the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of David according to the flesh and the Son of God as to His Divine nature: or, this principle being denied, then the Son of David

is the Son of God, and on the other hand, equally the Son of God is the Son of David, that is, in the one case, the human nature has become Divine; and in the other, the Divine nature has become human; and that not by way of the inter-communication of attributes, but by way of formal and complete transmutation.

These considerations appear to reduce the proposition that the Divine nature of our Lord suffered to an absurdity. For, if the Canon of Interpretation adopted by all who hold the real humanity and supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only persons who have any interest in this discussion, be admitted, the argument proves too little, for each class of affirmations can be referred to its proper subject; and if it be rejected, the argument proves too much; for it proves that between the finite and the infinite, the human and the Divine, there is really no essential difference; for each nature not only by possibility can, but each nature has in fact become the other!

(4) Equally strong as an argument, and perhaps more convincing on account of our greater knowledge is the fact that if the Scriptures teach that the Divine nature suffered; then they also teach and for the same reason, that, Christ in His Divine nature obeyed the Law binding on us. But such obedience is simply impossible; for God cannot have another God before Him, and He cannot observe the Sabbath as we are bound to observe it, namely, as a means of spiritual improvement; nor can He break the Sabbath as we can break it by labor, for in Him labor does not produce weariness, and therefore rest as refreshment is not needed; nor can God covet what belongs to others, for He Himself is the possessor of all things and He need not covet, for as a being perfect in knowledge and power His resources are as boundless as His desires.

The Scriptures, therefore, do not teach that the Lord Jesus Christ suffered in His Divine nature, but they teach precisely the opposite in all they reveal of God as an infinitely perfect being; perfect not as creatures are, of their kind, but absolutely; supreme without a rival, in all places without motion,

efficient without exertion and blessed beyond peradventure of change.

II. The second general argument is derived from a detailed examination of the case to be provided for, in the light both of reason and revelation.

This requires us to consider our first parents in the estate in which they were created, namely, as perfect after their kind; in reference to the special Providential arrangement made with them, and as in a state of condemnation.

1st. Our first parents and all creatures are (1) liable to fall from the estate in which they were created, for the simple reason that they are creatures. Therefore, while continued obedience strengthens virtuous principles and therefore makes it less and less likely that sin will be committed; yet no obedience however long continued can make it certain that creatures will not fall into sin for the reason that they are by the very condition of their existence liable to change.

(2). The Law of God relative to creatures of the same kind is, as a rule of duty, the same at all times, the present, past and future, and in all places, heaven, earth and hell; and its obligation is perfect and perpetual, and independent of ability to keep it or inability.

(3). If a creature is simply under law and incurs its penalty, then, as far as we know either from the nature of the case or from anything God has revealed, his redemption from that penalty is simply impossible. For the claims of the law are both perfect and perpetual, and therefore the time can never come when the Law has no further claims, and when as a consequence, release can be demanded as a matter of right.

2d. In regard to the special arrangement made with the first Adam, commonly called the Covenant of Works, it is to be remarked first, (1) that if this transaction meant anything, it meant that Adam was placed by an act of Divine condescension under a Covenant in order to his confirmation in life, that is, for perpetual completeness as he then was. This was his greatest good, and as to it, he was put upon probation

in order to secure, by his own obedience, this greatest of all blessings.

(2) In the next place it must be remembered that the claims of a Covenant and of a Law, while they are alike in that they both require perfect obedience, are different in that the claims of a Covenant are, in the nature of the case, limited as to time; just as the claims of a Law, from the very nature of law, are unlimited. From the claims of Law, therefore, as law, in the reason of the thing, there can be no deliverance; but from the claims of a Covenant, because it is a covenant, deliverance is possible, and in the case of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, it has become actual.

3d. When men are viewed as fallen and the subject of their restoration is proposed, then we know certainly that the claims of the Covenant of Works, which contains as an essential element the Law as a Rule of Duty, cannot be changed. These claims, therefore, must be met both as to precept and penalty in order to deliverance from them.

In order to meet the claim for penalty, the first proposition is, that the suffering of the Lord Jesus Christ as to His Divine nature, that is, infinite suffering, is unnecessary.

For first, we know certainly that the claim for obedience was a definite, finite thing for a definite time; such a claim, according to reason and the Scriptures, as the first Adam could fully meet. If, therefore, the claim was finite, it is hard to see how the penalty could be infinite in any other sense than that of indefinitely great, that is, ever increasing as to its intensity and endless as to the matter of time.

2d. If the penalty was infinite in any other sense than that of indefinitely great, it could not be inflicted. For it will always be true that the suffering endured at any given time is less than that to be endured at any succeeding period; and therefore in any particular case at any given time, it could be greater than it is, and therefore greater as a whole. The actual penalty, therefore, which neither falls short of nor goes beyond the just desert of sin, is not and never can be so great that it

can be no greater. But infinity taken in this sense is not infinity as God is infinite, nor does it even tend in that direction.

3d. If the Lord Jesus Christ did in fact suffer as to His Divine nature, then of course He could so suffer; and if He could suffer as Divine, then as Divine He could obey; and if as Divine He could both suffer and obey; then also He did not need a human soul either to suffer or obey, for no finite being can add value or efficacy to a work of an infinite being.

The suffering, therefore, of the Divine nature of Christ is certainly not necessary to, even if it be in accordance with the view that He took to Himself both a true body and a reasonable soul.

4th. Another argument is found in the difference universally admitted to exist between pecuniary and criminal satisfaction to legal claims.

In pecuniary matters, value for value, dollar for dollar, is necessary to cancel a claim; a debtor can never cancel a debt in any other way than by paying it in the exact terms of the agreement; and in a just Bankrupt law the Government merely says to the creditor that it has no means of collecting his debt, that is, it cannot perform the impossibility of making one dollar of assets pay two dollars of debt. In this case, therefore, the equivalent must be exact in order to satisfy the claim. But in criminal satisfaction, precise equivalents are generally impossible and perhaps never actual. For example, if a man commit the crime of murder once, twice or a score of times, with the forfeiture of his life the Law is satisfied, because its authority is maintained; and if two men or ten acting in concert slay only a single individual, the Law requires the life not of one of the two or ten, but the lives of all who were concerned in the transaction, for the reason that nothing less will maintain its authority. The claim for obedience, therefore which is definite and measurable, follows the analogy of pecuniary satisfaction; but the claim for suffering, which is in its own nature indefinite, being different in the same individual in

different circumstances, and in different individuals in the same circumstances, and deriving its sacredness and importance not only from the punishment deserved but also from the end to be secured, namely, the existence and well-being of Society; this claim if satisfied at all, must be satisfied in some other way than that of precise equivalents.

Two individuals, therefore, acting in a private capacity, may as between themselves settle their pecuniary accounts, in which only profit and loss are concerned, as they see fit and exchange receipts on such terms as they deem advantageous, for only they themselves are interested in the transaction; but when a public officer is dealing with crime, that is, with the right and wrong of things considered in themselves and in their relation to the State, his first and most important duty is to consider and maintain the interests of the public. When he has done this, then and not before is he at liberty to regard the interest of the criminal; that is, in order to pardon, in any particular case, the first and essential condition is that the law be maintained in all its authority and vigor.

The precise thing to be done, therefore, in order to release from a penalty imposed by a sentence is, not to find an exact equivalent to the penalty, but to find a way in which the claims of justice may be met in the very act of pardon, and the authority and efficiency of the Law as a means of public safety be maintained. In particular, a way must be found to leave the Law unimpaired,—(1) as to its claim to punish transgressors on the ground of the inherent ill-desert of sin, as a crime, not merely as damage; (2) as an object of confidence, that it will protect and defend the obedient; and (3) as a terror to evil-doers.

Whenever these conditions are complied with, the exercise of mercy in way of pardon is both right in itself and just according to the most stringent requirements of Law.

Now, this is precisely what the Lord Jesus Christ has done in the Work of Redemption. For, in order to comply with these conditions, with which no being merely human or only

Divine could comply, He joined our nature to His own in one person, thereby making that human nature the most exalted creature in the Universe; the most exalted in station, for it is the most nearly allied to God; and the most exalted in excellence, for it received the gifts of the Holy Ghost without measure; and it was distinguished from all other creatures of our race, by the fact that it was not, although human, under any obligation natural or legal to obey the Law binding on human beings; and, being thus unmeasurably exalted, He was, by Covenant, made under the Law; and He rendered to the precept precisely what was required of us, namely, a perfect obedience; and to the penalty, by His sufferings and death, all the satisfaction any law can demand or receive,—a satisfaction as complete as the infliction of the whole penalty on every individual of our race could have secured; that is, the satisfaction rendered by our Lord has left the Divine Law in unimpaired integrity and vigor for all the purposes for which any law exists. For, no creature was ever led to doubt the inherent evil nature and ill-desert of sin; no creature was ever led to distrust his safety in obedience; and no creature was ever tempted to commit sin, hoping to escape its punishment, by contemplating the mercy of God exercised on the ground of the satisfaction which the Lord Jesus Christ has rendered to the Divine Law.

This satisfaction, therefore, is all the nature of the case requires, and therefore it is all that is necessary to meet the case; and therefore anything else, more or different, is unnecessary. For, on the ground of it, God can be just in justifying the ungodly; and its moral power, that is, as deterring from sin, is as great as God Himself can make it.

The Second Proposition is,—The Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer as to His Divine nature, because such suffering, if actual, would be valueless as a satisfaction to the law binding on us.

The Law of God, that is, the Rule which expresses the duties creatures owe to their Creator, rests proximately on the Divine will, but ultimately on the Divine nature. It must,

therefore, be in all essential respects the same for all rational creatures, men or angels, good or bad, that is, as far as it expresses what is due from creatures as such, namely, veneration, love, confidence and obedience; and it must also vary in detail according to the specific nature of each class of beings. The angels, for example, are under no obligation to obey parents, or to rest as we do on the Sabbath; nor are human beings, in their present condition, required to be always active in the service of God, for by our present constitution, we need rest in the unconscious state of sleep.

Now the Law, which requires satisfaction in order to the salvation of human beings, is that which prescribes the essential duties of creatures in general, modified by the special nature of man. Any obedience, therefore, or suffering other than human, whether it be angelic or Divine, is of no value as a satisfaction to the law binding on us; for the reason, that it is not what the law requires of us: just as, on the one hand, no amount of suffering can avail to satisfy a pecuniary claim; nor, on the other, can any amount of money avail to satisfy for a crime; because, in neither case, is the thing offered the thing demanded. Hence, again, the necessity that the Son of God become incarnate, in order that He might, as human, render such a satisfaction, in matter and form, as the Law demanded of us. Such a satisfaction Christ did render, and therefore His work is valuable to us; but it is of no redemptive value to the angels that sinned, because it is not what the law they are under demands of them.

Divine suffering, therefore, even if actual, would be valueless to us or to any other order of sinful beings, because it is not what the law binding on creatures demands; and therefore it cannot be of the nature of a satisfaction to those demands.

Proposition third: Whether Divine suffering is possible in itself considered or impossible; yet such Divine suffering as is necessary in order that it may sustain any relation whatever to our redemption from the penalty of the law is simply impossible.

For, the suffering necessary to satisfy a penalty imposed by a

sentence is neither a misfortune nor a calamity, for it is specifically deserved. It is not such suffering as naturally arises within the mind itself by contemplating the misery of others, that is, it is neither emotional nor sympathetic, for it is not merely a pain experienced, but a pain inflicted; and, therefore, the endurance of the suffering does not depend on the willingness or unwillingness of the sufferer, for the desert of the suffering has been judicially ascertained and the punishment judicially imposed; and therefore unavoidable. It is unavoidable as a matter of right demanded by justice; and also as to any resistance that can be offered, because it is enforced by the whole power of the sovereignty whose law has been broken. But surely suffering as a punishment cannot pertain to a Divine being, because there is no superior in station or in power to inflict it; and yet, on the other hand, no suffering not inflicted and endured, in form, as a deserved punishment for sin can be of the nature of an expiation; and if it is not an expiation for sin, then it does and it can sustain no relation of any sort whatever to deliverance from sin.

Therefore, on the one hand, in general, because it is highly improbable that the Divine nature can suffer on account of its perfection, because if the Divine nature can suffer at all, it can, and as far as we know, must suffer infinitely, as well as be infinitely happy and blessed, that is, God can be at the same time both infinitely happy and infinitely miserable, that is, He can be infinitely contradictory; because the Scriptures, which ascribe grief and repentance to God, must be explained in some way that is consistent with what they teach of His perfection, and can be so explained; or else they are self-contradictory within the limits of our knowledge, and therefore false, for no being can be both omnipresent and local, omniscient and ignorant, in any way miserable and yet supremely happy. And, on the other hand, in particular, because the suffering of the Lord Jesus Christ as to His Divine nature is unscriptural in that in the first place such suffering is not necessary to a consistent interpretation of the Scriptures, because each class of predicates can be referred

to its proper subject, and then the argument proves too little; or, if the admission of Divine suffering is necessary, then the argument proves too much; for, on the same principle, the Scriptures also teach that the Son of God, as such, was dependent; that His human nature was deified, and that as Divine He could and did render such obedience as is possible only to creatures; because the case to be provided for, namely, the satisfaction of the Divine law, broken as a covenant, did not require such suffering as only an infinite being can endure, for the reason the claim terminated on a finite being, and therefore in justice it must have been such a claim as a finite being could fully meet; because the Lord Jesus Christ as to His human nature, which is the most exalted creature in the universe and under no obligations of any kind, moral or legal, to obey any law except that of its own nature, was by covenant made under the law binding on us, and by His obedience, His sufferings and His death, He left the law unimpaired in its authority to demand perfect obedience, to punish sin simply as sin, to protect the obedient and as a terror to evil-doers, He rendered to the law all the satisfaction any law can demand or receive; because Divine suffering, if actual, would be valueless as a satisfaction for us in that it is not what the law requires of us; and because compulsory legal suffering as a punishment, which the case demands, is simply impossible to a Divine being:—Therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of His work of Redemption.

In view of what has been said, it is certainly excusable to make, by way of concluding this article, a formal statement of the whole doctrine of our Lord's Satisfaction to the Divine Law, as a broken Covenant, demanding both obedience and penalty in order to release from its claims and to confer everlasting life.

1st. Our first father, as created, was, by the very constitution of his nature, under law.

2d. What obedience to the law, as law, could do for him was, on the one hand, to protect him while he continued in obedi-

ence; and on the other, to strengthen the virtuous principles of his nature and thereby render him less and less likely to fall; but no obedience, however long continued, could secure him against the danger of falling.

3d. Had the first Adam sinned against mere law, then, as far as we know, either from the nature of the thing, or from anything God has revealed in the Scriptures, deliverance from its penalty would have been simply impossible. For the claims of a law, as law, are perpetual, and therefore the time could never come when release could be demanded as matter of right.

4th. The first Adam was, in fact, placed not merely under law, as to which he was not; but also under covenant, as to which he was the federal head, that is, the representative of all his posterity in order to his own and their confirmation in life. This blessing, the law, as law, cannot give; for all the law proposes to do and all it can do, is to protect the obedient and punish the disobedient; and this blessing, namely, confirmation in life, the law as a covenant can give, for it is of the nature of a covenant, as distinguished from a law, to confer blessings upon the performance of stipulated conditions.

5. When the covenant was violated by sinning, it was by the very act abrogated as a covenant, while it remained in full force and virtue as a law. For no creature can take advantage of his own wrong, that is, he cannot impair obligation by violating it.

Our first father, therefore, having sinned, was perfectly helpless. The right to confirmation in life held out to him in the covenant was forfeited, its penalty was incurred, and his obligation to render perfect obedience to the law, as a rule of duty, remained unimpaired. He could not help himself, and no other creature could help him; for every creature owes for itself all the obedience possible for it to render, that is, an obedience both perfect and perpetual.

On the other hand the Scriptures teach:

1st. That the Lord Jesus Christ, Himself divine, and who as a divine person neither was nor could become subject to the law

binding on us, took to Himself, not a human person, for a human person would have been of necessity under obligation for itself, but a human nature on which no obligation can terminate, and therefore He was able, as to His human nature, to offer, if He chose, a meritorious, that is, an unowed obedience, and to endure meritorious, that is, undeserved suffering.

2d. The Scriptures teach that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of David, was made under the Covenant of Works, and that He satisfied all its claims, rendering to the Precept, which is a definite, measurable thing, a perfect obedience, and to the Penalty, which is in its own nature indefinite, and therefore cannot be referred to any exact standard of measurement, such suffering and so much of it as left the law in unimpaired authority and vigor for all the purposes for which any law can or does exist. For, as against its claims the most august creature God ever made, the most excellent in nature, the most exalted in station and the best beloved could not be spared. He could not be saved from the hour He dreaded to meet, nor pass by the cup He was reluctant to drink; and, to crown all, when His body was expiring on the Cross, His human soul was forsaken of the Father. Forsaken of God! The greatest suffering and the highest form of penalty God can inflict or the creature endure!!

Under this pressure, as great as sin itself deserves, the mortal life of our Lord Jesus gave way, and the work of satisfaction was finished.

Here then is a real and a meritorious offering for sin; necessary, the whole of it, to make salvation possible in a single case, for the broken covenant demanded it all; and all that is necessary in any number of cases, or for the salvation of all under the curse (the penalty) of the first covenant; for it is such a satisfaction as maintains the supremacy of the law as the authoritative measure of right and wrong, and as the ground of safety to the obedient and as an object of fear to the disobedient. For, in order to maintain this supremacy, a precise equality in suffering is not only not necessary, but in general not possible, and

in this particular case, not actual, for the Lord Jesus Christ certainly did not suffer as much as all the saved would have suffered throughout everlasting ages.

Therefore, 3d, what Christ did in satisfaction of the covenant of works is as sufficient for all without exception, for the whole race, numerous as it is, or if it were ten or ten thousand times more numerous, as it is for the salvation of a single individual; no more, no less; and it is just as suitable for all without distinction. For every sinner of our race needs just this, and no sinner needs anything more or anything different as the ground of his justification before God. The legal difficulty to salvation, therefore, is removed from the way of every sinner of our race by the one satisfaction of Christ, just as certainly and just as fully as the one transgression was the ground of the condemnation of all our race, and would have been, had the number represented by the first Adam been greater than it is or less. For, as on the one hand, one transgression violates the terms of the covenant as really and as fatally as a thousand transgressions; so on the other, the one satisfaction of Christ is necessary to and all that is required for the salvation of one or of all, or any other number, of those who are under the curse of the first covenant. Indeed, the one work of Christ satisfied the Divine law more fully than the perdition of the whole race could satisfy it. For Christ not only suffered the penalty, but He also rendered a perfect obedience to the precept, which the perdition of the whole race could not have secured. It is in Christ, therefore, and only in Christ, that the Divine law, as a rule of duty or as a covenant of life has ever been fulfilled.

The difficulty, therefore, that remains in the way of the salvation of any sinner is a difficulty that arises, not from the satisfaction made to the law in regard to either its sufficiency or its suitableness; but it arises from his sinful nature, which makes a sinner, however willing he may be to escape the punishment due to his sins, unwilling to be saved by grace. But no law can take cognizance of a moral difficulty by way of providing a remedy for it. A moral difficulty, if removed at all,

must be removed by some power external to and independent of the law, or even of the Gospel viewed simply as a system of truth, presenting a way of escape from sin and imposing duties; such, for example, as repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the plan of salvation, this moral difficulty is removed by the Holy Spirit; who, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ and renewing our wills (affections) persuades and enables us to embrace Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel.

Lastly: What other results, in addition to the justification and sanctification of believers, flow from the work of Christ as related to the covenant of redemption in particular, or to the purposes of God in general,—these things, although of the greatest importance to us and of the greatest interest to all intelligent creatures, the question proposed for discussion does not require us to consider.

It may be doubted whether the following Collection of Authorities is worth the trouble of making it, but having been made, it may be worth preserving.

DIVINE PASSIBILITY?

FIRST: DIRECT DENIAL.

I. The Confessions.

1. The Council of Chalcedon; Hammond's Apostolical Canons, pp. 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 146.
2. Fidei ratio, Zwingli; Niemeyer, p. 18.
3. Expositio Fidei, Zwingli; Niemeyer, p. 42.
4. Conf. Helvetica posterior, Niemeyer, p. 485.
5. Anglican Conf. of A.D. 1592, Art. I., Niemeyer, p. 592.
6. Compendium, American Ref. Church, Question 33.
7. Form of Concord, Hase, pp. 766, 772.
8. Catechism of Council of Trent, Streltswolf, pp. 149-150.

II. Theologians.

1. Augustine, quoted by De Moor, 21: 16.
2. Anselmus, *Cur Deus homo*, Book I., Chap. 8.
3. Calvin, *Institutes*, Book 2: 14: 2, 3: 11: 8.
4. Turretine, 13: 6: 21, 14: 2: 5; *De Sat. Disp.*, 10th Sec., 16, 17.
5. Witsius, *Econ. of the Covenants*, 2: 4: 20, 2: 8: 3.
6. *Marekii Compendium*, 20: 19, 21: 16.
7. De Moor, 19: 23, 19: 25 (5, a) 20: 19, 21: 16.
8. Grotius, *De Sat.*, Chap. 8: 16.
9. Stapfer, *iii.*, Sec. 362.
10. Fisher's *Catechism*, Question 21: 32, 22: 29.
11. President Edwards, *Hia. of Redemption*, Period ii., Ch. 1, Part 1.
12. Bretschneider, quoted in *Princeton Theo. Essays*, i., p. 316.
13. Boston, *ii.*, p. 10, 18; Dwight, *ii.*, p. 217; Watson, *ii.*, p. 135; Hodge, *ii.*, pp. 395, 402, 483; Hodge A. A. *Atonement*, pp. 30, 311.

SECONDLY: DENIAL BY WAY OF IMPLICATION.

I. The Confessions.

1. Geneva Cat., Niemeyer, p. 131.
2. Gallic Conf., Art. 14, Niemeyer, p. 333.
3. First Scotch Conf., Sec. 9, Niemeyer, 344.
4. Heidelberg Cat., Questions 16 and 37; *Compend.*, Question 33.
5. *Czengerina*, pp. 543, 549, 550.
6. Anhalt, pp. 631, 634-5.
7. Westminster Conf., Chap. 8: 4; *Larger Cat.*, Questions 38, 39.
8. *Form of Concord*, Hase, p. 608.
9. *Cat. of Council of Trent*, Streitwolf, p. 138.

II. Theologians.

- Turretine, 13: 3: 19; 13: 6: 21; 14: 10: 12.
 Vol. iv., *Disputation* 10th, Sec. 17.
 Vol. iv., *Disputation* 11th, Sec. 6.
 Stapfer, Vol. i., Sec. 1096.
 Witsius, *Lib. ii.*, 6: 40.
 Vitringa, quoted by Hodge, *iii.*, 147.
 Geierus, *Lutheran, Disputatio de Sat.*, pp. 757-8, 761, 766.
 Boston, i., p. 91.
 Ridgley, i. p. 404.
 Hodge, A. A. *Outlines*, Chap. 21: *Ques.* 2 (?).

IV.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS OF SCOTLAND AND THEIR NEW SERVICE BOOK.*

BY REV. WILLIAM FREDERICK FABER.

THE announcement that Presbyterians in Scotland had just published a book of written prayers and liturgical services would of itself be received, by the general American reader, with astonishment, if not incredulity; much as if, let us say, some one informed him that His Holiness Leo XIII. had issued an encyclical reinstating Communion in both kinds, or permitting the priesthood to marry. But surprising as the announcement is, we have the proof of its trustworthiness in *A Book of Common Order* which we have seen with our eyes and handled with our hands; of whose growth, up to a sixth edition in 1890, we gave the readers of the REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW an account last October.

When, however, we now add the further information that from the United Presbyterian Church (familiarily known as the "U. P. Church") a Prayer Book has emanated, very few indeed among us, we venture to say, but will regard it as a thing passing strange if true.

For, after all, the "Kirk," whose ministers are so largely enlisted in the liturgical movement referred to, is an *Established Church*; and in established Churches we are wont to look for a certain latitude of opinion and practice; witness the Church of England, and the Church of Prussia. This we may admit, without charging—as did a good Presbyterian elder, in a con-

* *Presbyterian Forms of Service*. Issued by the Devotional Service Association in connection with the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh: 1891 pp. vii. 168.

versation with the writer, on the Scotch Liturgy—that 'established Churches are always worldly, and naturally tend to drift away from simple spirituality!' A charge like that is always easily made, carries a certain plausibility on the surface of it, and is difficult to answer because in its sweeping generality it may compass some truth; but it is nevertheless a charge which convicts no one and settles nothing, for that is the very question at issue—whether any particular movement is, or is not, an effect or a symptom of worldliness. This real question is brought to the front with new force when, in a quarter antecedently so unlikely, we see the manifestation of the same liturgical spirit; when the United Presbyterians of Scotland also produce a book of written prayers and of liturgical forms.

But before we give more particular account of this publication, it will be well to set ourselves right in regard to the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland itself. Let us at once say that this Church is not, as such, either mother or sister of the United Presbyterian Church in this country. To make this clear, we shall need to recall briefly the history of the two bodies.

In 1733 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland cast out Ebenezer Erskine, and three other ministers who publicly expressed agreement with him, for the offence of rebuking certain corruptions in doctrine and administration; and these men with others who ere long joined them, formed a Presbytery to which they gave the name of "the Associate Presbytery." From this beginning there grew, through many vicissitudes, the United Secession Church, numbering in 1847 not far from four hundred congregations, and having sixty missionaries in foreign lands.

In 1752 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland issued sentence of deposition against the Rev. Thomas Gillespie for refusing to take part in installing an unworthy minister over an unwilling people. He had been the only one bold enough to maintain his stand, though it appears that his whole Presbytery took the same view of the case that he did. Gillespie gathered a congregation about him, was eventually joined by other min-

isters, and they together formed in 1761 the "Relief Presbytery"—for the "relief" of congregations on whom patronage thrust unworthy ministers. With Erskine this abuse of patronage was but one of several grievances; but with Gillespie, having lost his living because of his protest against this oppression, the separation of Church and State, at least the entire independence of the Church in things spiritual, became naturally the distinctive principle which his "Relief Church" movement must embody. Doctrinally he had no contention with the Kirk; and even less than Erskine and his friends, did he stand on sectarian ground. In 1847 this body numbered 114 congregations, with 45,000 members.

And in 1847 these two bodies—the United Secession Church and the Relief Church—came together under the name of the "United Presbyterian Church of Scotland." Since that time there has not only been constant and considerable numerical growth, but in other most important respects there has been great progress, of which more presently.

Let us now discover the antecedents of our American United Presbyterian Church. In 1742 Lancaster and Chester County (Pa.) Presbyterians petitioned Mr. Erskine's Associate Presbytery in Scotland to send them ministers, but their request could not be complied with till 1753, at which date the Scotch Presbytery had grown into a Synod. Two ministers then came, and in obedience to instructions organized an Associate Presbytery in this country, to be a member of the Associate Synod in Scotland. But, three years before this, in answer to similar requests, the Reformed Presbyterians ("Covenanters") had sent over a minister, who with two Irish Presbyterian ministers constituted in 1774 a Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery. Not to dwell unduly upon the subsequent history, which involves, as did the history of the Scottish Presbyterians, repeated and more or less fruitless efforts at union, in 1858, at Pittsburgh, Pa., there was formed the "United Presbyterian Church of North America," the constituents being the legitimate successors of the above named two Presbyteries. Its first General Assembly

represented 5 Synods, 42 Presbyteries, 408 ministers, and some 55,000 communicants.

Now what is of significance as bearing upon our present topic is this: That the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church of North America stand to-day for very different types of Church life in doctrine and worship; and their present differences become a little more intelligible to us when we recall their respective origins. Both of these communions go back, on one side, to the "Associate Presbytery" of 1738; but in the Scottish body there was an alliance with a more catholic element, in the American with one certainly less catholic. In Scotland, so it would appear to the writer, the other element (the "Relief" movement) exerted a broadening influence, so that, even at the consolidation, there was secured a liberal platform for the united body. In America, on the contrary, the stricter and more sectarian temper of the "Covenanter" prevailed, and that is to-day the stamp which the united body bears.

Lest we seem to assert too much, let us adduce a few further facts in evidence. In America, United Presbyterians hold to close communion; in Scotland, Gillespie had said, "I hold communion with all that visibly hold the Head," and there the United Presbyterians to-day practice the same catholicity. In America their communicant membership is held to the same confessional subscription as the clergy and officers; in Scotland there is no doctrinal test administered to members on their admission. In America we may safely venture to say there is no immediate danger of a revision of the Confession; in Scotland, following after a liberal provision in the Basis of 1847, there came a Declaratory Act in 1879 whose Preamble and Seven Propositions embody, on the chief points of Calvinistic Theology, a very large and progressive statement.*

* In view of the importance of this Declaratory Act as one solution of the problem now engaging the largest body of the Presbyterians in America, we print it here in full:

"Whereas the formula in which the Subordinate Standards of this Church

In America the following declaration is still of binding force: "That it is the will of God that the songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in His worship, both public and private, to the end of the world; and, in singing God's praise, these songs should be employed, to the exclusion of the devotional compositions of uninspired men"—using them of course in metrical versions; in Scotland, the United Presbyterians were the first among Presbyterians to introduce hymns other than paraphrases into their worship.

Not to specify other points of difference, as for instance in the matter of organs and instrumental music, enough has been said to show that a liturgical movement in the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was not so antecedently improbable as it certainly would have seemed to us. What Mrs. Oliphant

are accepted requires assent to them as an exhibition of the sense in which the Scriptures are understood; whereas these Standards, being of human composition, are necessarily imperfect, and the Church has already allowed exception to be taken to their teaching, or supposed teaching, on one important subject; and whereas there are other subjects in regard to which it has been found desirable to set forth more fully and clearly the view which the Synod takes of the teaching of Holy Scripture; therefore the Synod declares as follows:

"1. That in regard to the doctrine of redemption as taught in the Standards, and in consistency therewith, the love of God to all mankind, His gift of His Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and the free offer of salvation to men, without distinction, on the ground of Christ's perfect sacrifice, are matters which have been, and continue to be, regarded by this Church as vital in the system of Gospel truth, and to which due prominence ought ever to be given.

"2. That the doctrine of the Divine decrees, including the doctrine of election to eternal life, is held in connection and harmony with the truth that God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; and that He has provided a salvation sufficient for all, adapted to all, and offered to all in the Gospel; and also with the responsibility of every man for his dealing with the free and unrestricted offer of eternal life.

"3. That the doctrine of man's total depravity, and of his loss of 'all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation,' is not held as implying such a condition of man's nature as would affect the responsibility under the law of God and the Gospel of Christ; or that he does not experience the striving and restraining influences of the Spirit of God; or that he cannot perform actions in any sense good, although actions which do not spring from

calls "the Renaissance of the Scotch Church," the throb of a renewed Church life evident in more catholic sympathies, could not remain unfelt in this communion, standing on the basis deliberately chosen in 1847, and holding to the traditions it had inherited. For, a liturgical movement is not simply an effort to bring to the public worship of the sanctuary the fruits of purer taste, truer art, better form—an improvement chiefly æsthetic: where there is nothing more than this, things may be expected to become (liturgically) worse before they are better. A true liturgical movement is at bottom an impulse of Faith: the Church once more becoming a reality instead of an abstraction; and, therewith following, an effort to slough off sectarianism, and be once more simply *Church*; and, of course, by necessary consequence, a spirit of Christian Unity. As flowers

a renewed heart are not spiritually good or holy,—such as accompany salvation.

"4. That while none are saved except through the mediation of Christ and by the grace of His Holy Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how it pleaseth Him; while the duty of sending the Gospel to the heathen who are sunk in ignorance, sin and misery, is clear and imperative; and while the outward and ordinary means of salvation for those capable of being called by the Lord are the ordinances of the Gospel; in accepting the Standards it is not required to be held that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend His grace to any who are without the pale of ordinary means, as it may seem good in His sight.

"5. That in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate, and his authority and duty in the sphere of religion as taught in the Standards, this Church holds that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the Church, and 'Head over all things to the Church, which is His body;' disapproves of all compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion; and declares, as hitherto, that she does not require approval of anything in her Standards that teaches, or may be supposed to teach, such principles.

"6. That Christ has laid it as a permanent and universal obligation upon His Church at once to maintain her own ordinances, and to 'preach the Gospel to every creature;' and has ordained that His people provide by their free-will offerings for the fulfilment of this obligation.

"7. That in accordance with the practice hitherto observed in this Church, liberty of opinion is allowed on such points in the Standards, not entering into the substance of the faith, as the interpretation of the 'six days' in the Mosaic account of the creation; the Church guarding against the abuse of this liberty to the injury of its unity and peace."

are natural in springtime, and as fruit ripens during the genial summer—the thing of real significance and potency being the awakening Spring itself and the teeming Summer—so a liturgical movement is nothing of itself: if genuine, it is one outward expression of what is going on beneath the surface, of what is coming to pass in the inner life. And it is good to observe, by tokens many and unmistakable, what is coming to pass in many quarters of our present day Protestantism; of which tokens *Presbyterian Forms of Service* is one of the latest.

The book in its Preface does, indeed, deprecate “the imposition of a Liturgy,” meaning thereby, we take it, the obligatory and invariable use of a Liturgy; and further states that the forms given “are not intended to be used liturgically, but are offered merely as illustrations.” This is well, for two reasons: first, because Presbyterianism can never consistently return to the “imposition of a Liturgy” in such a sense, and we believe that Episcopalians themselves will come round to such a position eventually as that their Liturgy shall be held to be made for man and not man for their Liturgy; secondly, because the written prayers of this book, like most present day compositions in that kind, would prove rather wooden upon constant reiteration. But that does not sacrifice the liturgical principle. It remains yet to ask, What is the *structure* of these services? What is the *matter* of petition and intercession, of praise and thanksgiving? What is the range of models studied and followed? Is it confined to two or three centuries of Scottish Presbyterianism, or even Protestantism; or does it go back to the Early Church also? Considering all these circumstances, to wit: that it is the first book put forth by this Devotional Service Association, that it is for a ministry and a people bred, after all, in the atmosphere of Scotland*—we think this book on the whole very satisfactory as to both what it is and what it is not.

* That we mean nothing disrespectful to Scotland, but rather the more honor to these pioneers in a good work, let the reader satisfy himself by a perusal of an article in *Blackwood's* for November, 1890, on “The New Liturgies of the Scottish Kirk.”

But let us look through the book with more particular attention to its details.

First is given a Lectionary, in which, after Lessons for each Lord's Day in the civil year, is made some little provision for the festivals in the Church Year. Then follow some eight pages of carefully chosen Scripture sentences, for the beginning of worship. The Order of Service is the same for morning and evening, and is as follows: 1. Sentences. 2. Invocation, the people at the close of this, as of all prayers saying or singing, Amen. 3. Metrical Psalm or Hymn. 4. Confession and Supplication. 5. Lesson from the Old Testament. 6. Prose Psalm chanted, or Scripture sentence sung. 7. Lesson from the New Testament. 8. Thanksgiving, Intercession, Lord's Prayer said by all. Silent Prayer. 9. Psalm or Hymn, of Praise. 10. Prayer for Illumination. 11. Sermon. 12. Psalm or Hymn. 13. Brief Prayer. 14. Doxology. 15. Benediction.

The offering, if any, is placed between 8 and 9.

In addition to the prayers and collects embodied in the morning and evening services which are treated in full pp. 19-35, there are several more pages of selected collects.

Pausing a moment at this point, we note the great advance which such a scheme of service betokens over that which it is to supplant. But we note also the same excess, and the same defect, which are the generic marks of Protestant cultus, and more particularly of Calvinistic cultus: excess of the homiletic element, defect of the responsive element. Not that the sermon is too much made of; the fault lies deeper than that, and is, indeed, observable even in the English *Common Prayer*. We mean the vice of always and everywhere arguing, reasoning, explicating; whence come the too numerous "Dearly Beloved Brethren" of the Prayer Book, and the "eloquent and impressive prayers" of our non-liturgical divines. To make clear what we mean, lay down side by side "The Communion" of the Episcopal Church and "The Communion" of the new Lutheran *Common Service*. In the latter, service is more rigidly held to its own province, more entirely governed by its own

legitimate spirit; and this in spite of the fact that the *Prayer Book* tends to excess of ritual. Much greater the contrast when you take any of the Presbyterian Liturgies given in Baird's *Eutaxia*. The prayers, there written, with Presbyterians now unwritten, tend everywhere to be "preaching prayers;" they lack terseness, simplicity, directness; and therefore they lack the true liturgical flow.

And passing from the excess, we note, as we have said, a defect of the responsive element. The people have still too little voice in the worship. True, they have the hymns—where they do have them, not yet usurped by the artistic choir and the unspeakable anthem!—but they ought as well to have more *spoken* part. It is a good beginning to make them say, as Scripture enjoins, Amen; it is also a good thing to have them say the Lord's Prayer. Both these are still, with some, dangerous innovations, and doubtless required of our compilers some degree of courage, and therefore are not to be lightly esteemed. But the movement should go, and probably will go, much further.

But the Communion Service, which now follows, claims our attention. We copy the *Order* in full.

PREPARATION AND INSTRUCTION.

1. Introductory Sentences of Scripture. 2. Psalm or Hymn (Introductory). 3. Prayer for Grace. 4. Reading of Scripture. 5. Psalm or Hymn referring to Christ's Atoning Work. 6. Pre-Communion Address.

THE COMMUNION.

7. The Words of Institution. 8. Eucharistic Prayer (the Congregation responding by singing the Sanctus or the Hosanna). 9. Silent Prayer, and Uncovering of the Elements. 10. Communion Hymn. 11. Blessing of the Bread, and Distribution. 12. Blessing of the Cup and Distribution. 13. Song of Thanksgiving.

EXHORTATION AND DEVOTION.

14. Exhortation. 15. Prayer of Self-Dedication and Intercession. 16. Concluding Hymn. 17. Benediction.

NOTE.—Should the Communion follow immediately upon the Sermon, Nos. 1-6 of the above may be omitted.

The Order thus outlined is filled out, point by point, in the succeeding pages, making at the least an ample Directory. But more than this. There are some standing parts which, though subject to some modification, yet suggest a degree of permanence; in this exactly parallel with the Ante-Nicene Liturgies. That, to instance but a few, there should be a *Sanctus* and *Hosanna*, and a modified *Sursum Corda* ("It is most meet, right, and our bounden duty," etc.) is a noteworthy fact.

Another Order for the Lord's Supper is given, simpler, but containing also an Eucharistic Prayer, with the *Sanctus*.

What we have said in criticism of the Morning and Evening Services of the Lord's Day, again, and with even greater force, will apply here. The prayers are, indeed, far from the foolish, aimless, sentimental, and "eloquent" order, which one sometimes hears; but they hardly rise to the height of the Communion prayers, of which the Holy Catholic Church now has so abundant treasure. More to be deplored is the absence of the directly responsive element, in which, here especially, it may be made outwardly manifest that all the communicants are set to be "an holy priesthood." Let us hope that, in much more besides the Lord's Prayer and the *Sanctus*, the people may have part in the highest of all Christian services.

After the Lord's Supper are given Orders for Baptism, for Admission to Full Communion, Ordination of Ministers, Ordination of Elders, and for the Dedication of a Church; and in conclusion, Orders for Marriage, and for Burial. The latter is very fully treated, in the way of Scripture and texts suggested, for which hardworked ministers will be duly thankful.

One thing we could not help observing: that the Apostles'

Creed is used but once in the whole book—in the Dedication of a Church; where it is given un mutilated, *i. e.*, with the *Descensus* clause left in its place. In the same service the *Te Deum* is also given. It seems that here, to the mind of the compilers, was the best place to begin with these much disused and misunderstood, but venerable and catholic forms: the consecration of a sanctuary suggesting naturally the days of the Church's first foundation, and the heritage of those days to which, by virtue of our continuity (unless we be a sect) we are justly entitled.

V.

CAN OUR PRESENT MODE OF PLACING PASTORS BE IMPROVED?

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, A.M.

THE inquiry to be discussed in this paper at once implies that our present mode of settling pastors is, in some respects at least, unsatisfactory and defective. Whether or not such be the case, will become manifest, we trust, by a description and an analysis of the mode of settling pastors now practiced amongst us. And should we, in our inquiry into the subject, discover defects and wrongs in our present practices, then it will be our duty to investigate the possibility and practicability of making such improvements in our present mode of procedure in the case, as will lessen if not entirely remove, these defects, without, however, opening the way for other defects equally great and deplorable as those now existing. For let it not be forgotten in the discussion of this subject, that changes are not always improvements, and, in remedying one wrong, room is often made for another wrong just as grievous.

The settlement of a pastor in a vacant charge, generally, necessitates the removal of a pastor from a charge in which he had been previously settled. Hence, before discussing the subject in hand in a direct way, we will give some attention to another inquiry, namely, When shall a pastor resign his charge? This is a matter intimately connected with the main question.

A leading professor in one of our theological seminaries, several years ago, in an article published in the *Messenger*, raised the question as to whether the pastoral relationship

ought not to be considered much in the same light as the marriage relationship. Is it not at least a spiritual union that ought not to be dissolved, except for the most weighty considerations?

Dr. J. H. Suydam of the Reformed Church in America, in a paper published in the *Christian Intelligencer*, last March a year, on "The duty in resigning a charge," introduced his subject with these words: "In churches of the Presbyterian order the minister is settled for life. This is the theory."

The position taken by these two eminent divines represents, no doubt, the ideal and theoretic conception of the pastoral relationship, as provided for in our system of Church order. But in this matter, as in everything else in this sinful, selfish and imperfect world, it is impossible, even approximately, to actualize the ideal; and our theory, however true and correct it may in itself be, we find to be largely impracticable, as Dr. Suydam, above quoted, also acknowledges in the body of his article, by describing a number of conditions when it becomes a pastor's duty to resign his charge. The principle that the ministry exists for the church, and not the church for the ministry must evermore be maintained. The church must not be made to suffer for the sake of the ministry; but the ministry, if need be, must make sacrifices, and suffer, perhaps wrongfully, for the sake of the church. Hence it becomes a minister's solemn duty to resign, when it becomes manifest that his continuance as pastor will work injury to the church.

But, though the true ideal cannot be fully, or even approximately actualized, it should not for that reason be renounced, or all efforts towards its actualization be abandoned. If the theory, as above stated, be a correct one, and consistent with our general system of church government and order, as it unquestionably is, then the Church should strive to bring her practices into conformity with her theory, and put forth her best efforts, all the time, to actualize her ideal, as much as possible. Is this being done? We fear not. Unmistakable evidences appear on all sides, that pastors and congregations are controlled by a very different conception of the pastoral rela-

tionship. When a minister is called and installed pastor of a charge, the general rule seems to be that he does not look upon the transaction as settling him for life, or for any very great length of time; but he regards it rather as a temporary arrangement only, a business agreement, not specially binding on the conscience, to be annulled at any time according to the will or whim of either party. As a consequence, he is prone to have eyes and ears open continually for a call to a more desirable field of labor. And when such call comes to him, without allowing his first installation to exert any restraining influence upon him, he simply resigns and goes to the new field. The solemn, ecclesiastical and spiritual act of installation is, without question, entirely too much trifled with.

In order to be true to their Lord and Master, and true to their installation obligations, when settled in a charge, ministers ought to put forth all their energies in the performance of their present duties, and with eyes and mind and heart set on the work in hand, they ought faithfully and patiently and cheerfully attend to the Master's business before them, without cherishing any serious or disturbing thoughts in regard to some other field of labor. But does such a spirit of devotion to the work in hand, of Christian patience and humble resignation, prevail among the pastors throughout the Church? Evidently not. For as soon as a charge becomes vacant, applications for the vacant field are at once sent in from all sections of the Church. We do not believe it a misrepresentation of the true state of affairs when we say, that about one-half of our pastors are always open to a call from a better field. And many are always on the *qui vive* for new work. This, surely, is an abnormal and unhealthy condition of things among the ministry.

But the rejoinder is made that, while the above statements are a correct representation of the prevailing spirit among the pastors of the Church, yet they are not to blame for the evil. The pastors would themselves rejoice "with an exceeding joy" if such were not the case, and they would be ready and willing

to have this state of things changed as quickly as possible. But the people, it is alleged, composing the congregations, have brought about and are evermore causing this restless spirit among the ministry; first, by not properly supporting the pastors set over them, and, secondly, by becoming restive under a pastorate that has continued for a number of years, and longing for a new shepherd to minister unto them in spiritual things.

It is undoubtedly true, that many of our charges are justly subject to such criticisms. They do not pay as large salaries as they could pay and in all honesty ought to pay. And frequently they do not meet their obligations to the pastor promptly, according to stipulations. And many members are not constant in rendering unto their pastor "all proper obedience in the Lord." As a consequence, many pastors are compelled to undergo privations and endure sufferings, and be filled with cares and anxieties in regard to worldly matters. In order to escape from such trials the pastor seeks a new field of labor. Again, the religion of many people is based on their personal feelings towards their pastor. The indifference and dereliction of such members, and their undisguised desire for a new minister, make it exceedingly unpleasant for a sensitive pastor and his family to continue their stay with such people. A new field is longed for.

But now, how is this wrong to be remedied?

1. Pastors ought to rise to the dignity and the rights of their position, and maintain by word and conduct, that, when duly called and regularly installed, then they are in charge of their work by the Lord's appointment; that they are ambassadors for Christ; that they have no right to forsake the work in hand; and further, that the people have no right to request or in any way cause them to resign their charges, unless there be unmistakable evidences that the Lord has work for them to do in other parts of His vineyard. Pastors ought, also, to cultivate such a spirit of Christian heroism, that would enable them to attend to the work assigned them, faithfully and patiently, though it re-

quire at their hands some unjust sacrifices and the endurance of some grievous wrongs.

2. And the classes throughout the Church ought to employ every means in their power to make pastors and charges realize that a pastoral relationship ought not to be dissolved, simply, because the minister would be personally benefited by making a change, or because the people desire a new pastor. The Classes ought to exercise the authority vested in them and insist upon it, that a pastor set over a charge shall do that work, and that the people are bound by the principles of common honesty, and by the higher and stronger principles of Christian fellowship and love, and by the most solemn ecclesiastical obligations, to render unto their pastor all proper obedience in the Lord, and to support him with a sufficient salary for his maintenance. Let the Classes, whenever the opportunity presents itself, urge pastors and charges to be faithful and true to their installation vows and obligations.

3. If pastors and the Classes would pursue the course above indicated, then, as a natural and necessary consequence, a considerable number of calls would be declined, and an equal number of resignations would be disallowed. And it is our opinion that if the number of applicants for the various vacancies, as they occur, were much reduced, and the number of rejections of calls largely increased, the effect upon ministers and congregations would be very wholesome and beneficial, and the first large step would thus be taken towards the improvement of our present mode of settling pastors.

But we are not unmindful of the fact that vacancies must of necessity occur. Vacancies are created by the death of pastors and by justifiable resignations. These vacancies cannot always be filled by graduates from our seminaries, as many of them require pastors of some age and experience in the work. Hence pastors must sometimes be taken from one charge and settled over another. Some calls ought, therefore, to be accepted and confirmed, and some pastoral relationships ought to be dissolved. And consequently our present mode of settling

pastors in vacant charges is a proper question for discussion, and the inquiry as to whether there is room for improvement in our present customs and practices, is entirely in place.

WHAT IS OUR PRESENT MODE?

A charge becomes vacant. The consistory invites some minister whom they know, or who has been recommended to them to preach in the charge with the view of becoming its pastor. After he has preached his "Trial Sermons" a congregational meeting is called and an election held, with this minister as the only candidate for the pastorate, to be voted for or against. If the result of the election is favorable to the candidate, the consistory, then, in the name of the congregation issues a call to him. He then after proper consideration either accepts or rejects the call. If he rejects it, the above process is repeated until some minister is found who does accept the call of the vacant charge to him. At this stage of the procedure, the case passes into the hands of Classis. If the minister is a member of a Classis different from the one to which the charge calling him belongs, he must then be relieved of the work in which he is engaged and dismissed by his Classis to the proposed new field of labor. At this point his Classis has the privilege and right of interfering with his plans and purposes, and of refusing to release him of his present obligation, or to dismiss him from its body. The Classes, however, ought not and do not take such negative action except for the most weighty consideration.

The Classis within whose bounds the vacant charge is located must consider the call to the minister and his acceptance thereof, with the view of confirming the same. This Classis has the right, because of irregularities or other sufficient reasons, to refuse to confirm the call. If such action be taken, it brings the procedure to an end, at least for the time being. But if the call be adjudged regular and there be no other grave obstacles in the way, it is then confirmed and a committee is appointed, who consummate the pastoral relationship by performing the installation ceremony.

Theoretically this is our mode of placing pastors; and at first view it seems a fair and judicious mode. But viewed in the light of its practical operations, it becomes subject to a number of unfavorable criticisms.

1. As soon as it becomes known throughout the Church that a given charge is vacant, applications for the pastorate are made, directly and indirectly, by ministers from near and far; names of available ministers are sent to the consistory from various quarters; professors of theological seminaries recommend their students; one member of the consistory hears of this minister, another member learns of some other minister that might be had. And as a consequence the consistory simply becomes bewildered by the large number of names of available ministers put before it. The officers know not whom to select. Their knowledge of the qualifications and adaptability for their pastorate of the ministers of the church is entirely too inadequate to enable them to make an intelligent and judicious selection of a candidate. Their action in the case consequently is apt to be largely a matter of guesswork. Some consistories, conscious of their inability to act intelligently in the matter, endeavor to supplement their knowledge of available ministers, by having a number preach for them successively, intending, after some experimenting in this way, to make a proper selection from among those thus brought before them. And in order not to violate the letter of the constitution, they have these ministers to visit them as supplies and not as candidates. Reasonable though this plan at first view appears, it has as a very general rule proven itself to be unsatisfactory to both the charges and the ministers. Our present mode of placing the entire responsibility of selecting a candidate for the pastorate upon the consistory, with anybody and everybody to recommend and advise, is neither efficient nor satisfactory.

In this connection it may be well to state some facts that are sometimes not kept in view. As is the case in other Churches, so in the Reformed Church, there are many ministers who possess all the necessary qualifications to serve efficiently any

charge in the entire denomination. And the number of such is much larger than vacant charges are apt to suppose. Hence congregations do not by any means gain as much as they imagine by being so fastidious in the selection of a pastor. They often pass many by, who, if chosen, would build up the people in their faith, and cultivate the Christian graces amongst them by edifying preaching and faithful pastoral work.

But there is after all a large number of ministers who are well qualified and specially adapted to the work of some charges, but who would not be so efficient in other charges. And there are a few persons in the ministry, too, who are incapable, for one reason or another, of serving any charge with a sufficient degree of success to justify their settlement in any pastorate. These facts will hardly be gainsaid. And now we hold that it is not possible for consistories, as a rule, to obtain such a discriminating knowledge of the ministry of the church as would enable them, unaided, to make an intelligent and judicious selection of a pastor.

2. The preaching of trial sermons is not a desirable feature in our present mode of placing pastors. In the first place, it is exceedingly unpleasant for a minister of ordinary sensitiveness to preach the gospel to a people when he is conscious and painfully conscious of the fact that his hearers are not present for the purpose of being edified by God's word, or to be spiritually benefited by the services of the sanctuary, but for the special purpose of inspecting the minister; of observing his personal appearance, his manner of reading, his mode of praying, and above all of passing judgment upon his sermons and his style of delivering them. A knowledge of this fact makes the sermons he preaches not only trial sermons but also exceedingly trying sermons for him. And in the second place, it is a great mistake for a congregation to suppose that they can form a correct judgment of a minister's fitness for the pastoral office amongst them simply by what they see and hear of him on the day he is put on trial before them. Some ministers have the ability of making a fine display of themselves when appearing

before a congregation for the first time, and then have but little left them after the first exhibition, with which to maintain for any great length of time, the first impressions made. They are like some shop-keepers who make a very striking exhibition of their goods in the show window, but do not have the quantity or quality of goods in stock with which to fulfill the promises made by the outside display. On the other hand, there are many other ministers who possess a large and continually increasing reserve force of knowledge, of wisdom, of good judgment, of pulpit ability and pastoral tact, and yet could not and perhaps would not try to make any specially marked impression upon the people to whom they have been invited to minister for the first time. And as a consequence of all this, it follows that serious mistakes are often made by congregations in selecting pastors. From which it results that inferior pastors are settled in superior charges, and superior pastors in inferior charges, and what is still worse, a number of efficient and faithful pastors are compelled to stand idle in the market place because no man hath hired them.

We see then the present mode of securing pastors for vacant charges is seriously defective. There is entirely too much looseness and uncertainty at many points in the procedure. Evils have resulted from our practices that loudly call for correction.

HOW SHALL IMPROVEMENTS BE MADE, AND WHAT REMEDIES SHALL BE APPLIED?

We will in the first place suggest some changes of a moderate character, and, secondly, others of a more radical nature.

1. We ask for such amendments to the constitution of the church as will make the directions given in regard to the matter in hand more definite and explicit. Let it be defined at greater length and in clear statements what the consistory shall do and shall not do; what the congregation shall do and shall not do; what the duties and privileges of the candidate are; and what the prerogatives and duties of the Classis are in the ecclesiastical transactions under consideration.

2. Let the constitution be enforced. One source of many evils has been, and now is, the ignorance and disregard of the present requirements of the constitution. The spirit and letter of that portion referring to the matter before us are often disobeyed by ministers and by congregations, and are not enforced by the Classes. Let the constitution be so amended as to be clear and definite on this point, and then let it be enforced and the effect on the church will be salutary and beneficial.

3. Let the importance of the "Trial Sermon" be reduced to the minimum. This feature of our present customs is often a delusion and a snare. People are frequently misled by the "Trial Sermon." The judgment of a congregation based solely on it is of but little value, be that judgment favorable or unfavorable. Hence the practice of having applicants for the pastorate occupy the pulpit on trial ought to be discountenanced. And the ministry could do much towards abolishing this custom by refusing to appear before congregations for trial. Congregations would then be compelled to gain their knowledge of available ministers in a different way. Our recommendation is that the consistory shall take the matter of procuring a pastor more fully in hand. Let them, by the aid of wise counsellors, thoroughly consider the ability and fitness of available ministers, and select such an one whom they can unanimously recommend, and then let every member of the consistory advocate the election of the minister whose name is placed before the congregation. The members of the congregation should then, under all ordinary circumstances, consider it their duty to vote for such a candidate.

This course would take much of the responsibility from the congregation, and place it on the consistory. And this is just what ought to be done. The powers of the consistory have been too much ignored in this very matter. We have been too democratic in our practices. The consistory is a distinct ecclesiastical body in our church order, is vested with authority and has some peculiar functions to exercise. The congregation ought to have some respect for the actions and decisions of the

consistory. The members of the church have a right to look to the consistory for guidance and direction. Let them be submissive to the consistory in the selection of a pastor as well as in other matters pertaining to the welfare of the congregation. Let the functions of the consistory be magnified, and let the preaching of "Trial Sermons" be made unprofessional if not indeed disreputable in the eyes of the church, and one improvement will be made in our present practices. The business world pursues the general course here indicated in the selection of men for various positions. Boards of trustees elect professors in colleges and principals of schools on the strength of their reputation for ability and efficiency; directors of corporations select managers and other officers on the basis of their faithfulness and accomplishments in other positions. Cannot the church adopt a somewhat similar plan of equal wisdom in selecting pastors for vacant charges?

But in our opinion the efficiency of our church government would be very much enhanced if some changes were made in our practices, more radical than those already enumerated. The three leading forms of church government are the Episcopal, the Presbyterial and the Congregational. We do not want any changes made in our church in the direction of congregationalism; we have more of that element in our system at present than is desirable. Some of our sister denominations have Bishops. But the functions of a Bishop may be very limited or very much enlarged. Hence there are Bishops and Bishops. In some churches the main prerogative of the Bishop is to administer the Sacraments and perform the sacramental rites of the church. In other churches the Bishop has to do mainly with the governmental affairs of the church. And in others the Bishop is a monarch in his diocese, ruling everything under him with an iron hand. Would our system of church order be improved by the establishment of the separate office of Bishop, whose incumbent in addition to other duties should have control over the matter of settling pastors in vacant charges?

We do not believe that any particular form of church government exists by "divine right." We can endorse the statement made in the Scotch confession, adopted in 1560, which in Art. 20, speaking of the form of Government says, "We do not think that any policie and an ordour in ceremonies can be appoynted for all ages, times and places." And we file no objections to the position taken by the Westminster confession (Art. I, Sec. 6,) when it says "That there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of human nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word." In the New Testament elements of Congregationalism, of Presbyterianism and of the Episcopacy may unquestionably be found. In our opinion, in any given country, that form of church government ought to be adopted and developed which is most clearly allied to the civil government of the country and most in harmony with the general spirit of the people. For example, in a country whose national government is that of a monarchy, absolute or limited, a strong episcopal form of church government would no doubt be well adapted to the circumstances and be efficient. Whereas, in a country whose government has for a century or more been that of a free republic, a monarchical system of church order would not be so well adapted to the spirit of the people, nor would it likely be the most efficient. We do not think that any church officer, whatever the name of his office might be, with the prerogative and powers of a Bishop in the Roman Church, would be able to work harmoniously and accomplish any important good results in any Protestant church in the United States. But might not the Reformed Church provide for herself Bishops with functions similar to those exercised by the Bishops in the Methodist Episcopal Church? In this latter church the Bishops annually appoint every pastor to his particular field of labor. And as a general rule the various congregations are supplied with suitable pastors; and what is perhaps the most commendable feature in this system is that

every minister is assigned to some work and no congregation is allowed to remain vacant. Where there are no unemployed ministers and no vacant charges, there, there is efficiency in the government.

But the free working of this system is largely interfered with in the churches that have been practicing it. The prevailing spirit of the people in our country is dominated by the idea of individual liberty. The people of our land are very sensitive as to their personal rights. And this spirit asserts itself in various ways in the Methodist Church. Ministers often resort to different means by which they seek to influence the appointing power, so that their wishes and aspirations may be satisfied. And congregations not unfrequently inform the Bishop and his cabinet, in one way or another, and in no uncertain words, of their wishes and desires. And every now and then there comes to the surface a good deal of restlessness and chafing on the part of ministers and people under the appointments made by the Bishop. And were it not for the itinerancy, which is a fundamental element in their system, it is very doubtful whether their mode of stationing pastors could be maintained for many years longer. If the itinerancy were to be discontinued, and ministers were obliged to accept their appointments, and congregations to receive their pastors for an indefinite period of time, then the appointing system would have to be materially modified so as to allow ministers and people the exercise of more rights and greater privileges; else the appointing system would in all probability entirely fail them.

As we have already seen, in the Reformed Church pastorates are supposed to continue for a considerable length of time. In fact, the fundamental idea in our system is the direct opposite of that underlying the itinerancy. Hence it would prove impracticable for us to adopt, at least in full, the appointing system in vogue in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The people of the United States sometimes proudly boast that they have the best government and civil institutions in the

whole world. Without affirming or denying this claim, we would say that unquestionably our form of civil government is the best possible for our own people. And the government of the Reformed Church is very similar to that of the nation. Though the church, in formulating her system of government, did not pattern after the national order; the nation rather followed the lines marked out by the church. The presbyterial form of church government, in which the idea of a federal Republic is very predominant, is much older than the Constitution of the United States, and it is altogether probable that the authors of the national system were influenced more or less by the leading principles underlying the governmental system of the Reformed Churches. But in this matter, as in all things, always, and everywhere, the children of this world were wiser than the children of light. Our statesmen, in framing a constitution for the country, developed at once more fully the idea of a republic, and made provision for the administration of the three essential elements in every government, namely, the legislative, the judicial and the executive. Our system of church government is republican in form; and we are persuaded that we would not gain anything by exchanging it for some other form. We do not believe that any other form would be as well adapted to our circumstances and condition, and be as efficient in its operations as the form under which we are now working. But our system needs to be more fully wrought out and perfected in all its parts. In so far as any legislative, judicial and executive functions are exercised in our system at the present time, they are all mixed up together in each and every judicatory of the church; whereas the leading functions of a government ought to be separated from each other and lodged in different departments of administration. Our classical and synodical bodies are largely legislative in character. They do also at times exercise judicial functions. But scarcely any provision is made in our system for the executive element. It does not lie within the province of this paper to set forth the defects and describe the needs of our government on its judicial

side. In the new constitution, which had been before our church and is now in the hands of a committee for revision, full and definite provision was made for a judicial department. We wish to call attention to the weakness of the executive element in our government. Properly speaking, we have no executive officers at all. The presidents of our various judicatories are not executive, but really only presiding officers. There is no one in our system clothed with authority to execute the enactments and decisions of our classes and synods. There can be no question but that some officer is needed to enforce the constitution of the church and the actions of its legislative bodies. The subject under consideration in this article does not require us to show the many different ways in which an executive officer would be useful and beneficial to the church in general, but rather to point out the necessity for some such officer in the matter of securing pastors for vacant charges.

We believe our system of Government, in so far as it relates to the matter in hand, would be much improved, if each district Synod had a Bishop. Though we are not concerned about the name of such Synodical officer. He might be called a Superintendent, or Manager, or Director. But the name Bishop is biblical and historical, and the meaning of it is significant and very appropriate. A Bishop is an Overseer. What each Synod of our Church, in our view, needs is a Bishop to oversee the settlement of pastors in vacant charges. Other duties might also be assigned to him; such for example as attending to the Mission interests of the Synod. He might, as time and opportunity afforded, supply vacant Mission points and vacant charges until regular pastors would be settled over the same. But our plea now is for such an officer who shall aid and control charges in securing pastors. The course of procedure which we would recommend then is the following: When a charge becomes vacant let the consistory immediately inform the synodical Bishop of the fact. Let the Bishop make a thorough investigation of the wants, needs and condition of the charge, and then with the advice and consent of the consistory

place the name of a minister before the congregation for election. Let all applications for the charge be made to the Bishop, and let no candidate come before the congregation except such an one as has first been nominated by the Bishop. If the election held on the first name should result unfavorably to the nominee, or should he decline the call, the same process would have to be repeated with another candidate. If it should be deemed advisable to have the candidate preach before the congregation, after the nomination has been made and before the election is held, then let that be done. But we believe that in the majority of cases such preaching would not be necessary, nor would it be demanded. This modification or change in our present practices could be made without changing our general system of church government. Of course, constitutional provision would have to be made for the plan suggested and rules would have to be adopted for the election, tenure of office, guidance and government of the Bishop. An order of procedure that would deprive the congregation or its consistory of all voice in the selection of a pastor would be too revolutionary in its character to be introduced into our system, and would be altogether impracticable in the present condition of our church life. But the change which we are advocating, we believe, would be practicable, and beneficial to the Church.

BENEFITS.

1. The plan we have proposed would bring order out of the confusion which now so often prevails in the selection and settlement of pastors. The procedure would from beginning to end be under the direction and control of an efficient head. The looseness and uncertainty which adhere to our present practices would be displaced by definiteness and certainty.

2. It would enable the Church in her organized form to discharge the parental duty which she owes to the congregation as her child. The congregation must be cared for and provided with proper spiritual food. Congregations, like children, often know what they want but not what they need. The Church

through the functions of the Bishop would aid each congregational flock to secure such a shepherd as would nourish it with proper spiritual meat and spiritual drink.

3. It would bring about a better adjustment of the ministers to the various charges of the Church. Each minister would be likely to secure such a charge for which he is specially qualified. Less mis-fits would be made, than are caused by our present want of system.

4. It would bring into efficient service many of the ministers who are now waiting and longing for employment. It would result in less idle ministers and less vacant charges.

5. It would have a tendency to lessen materially the length of vacancies. Under our present arrangements charges remain vacant from one to six months, and sometimes indeed for a longer period. Through the helpful work of the synodical Bishop these long vacancies could be obviated; which would be a great gain.

6. It would bring into proper prominence the love and authority of the Church as represented by the person and functions of the Bishop; it would bring the office and power of the consistory into their legitimate relation to the church above and to the congregation below it; and it would cause the congregation to realize that, for the sake of its welfare, it must needs be in willing subjection to the authority of the Church over it.

7. And in case the "trial sermon" would have to be brought into use, it would free it of most of its objectionable and unpleasant features; and in many instances would entirely obviate the necessity of it.

In some sections of the Church the committee on supply performs a work similar to that which we are now asking to have committed to a synodical Bishop; and whenever this committee is unmolested by outside interference, and the charge submits to its guidance and direction, the result proves satisfactory to all parties. But the performance of such work by this committee is an assumption of authority for which there is at present

no constitutional warrant—an authority too which can be exercised only by the tolerance of the charge.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

We will yet notice briefly a few objections to the plan of settling pastors in vacant charges, which we have submitted in this paper. It may be said that the same evils of which we now complain would also largely attend the mode of procedure suggested by us, and hence it would be no improvement. To this we can only reply, that an absolute certainty as to the results of such a system can be obtained in no other way than by putting it into operation. Experience alone can reveal to a certainty what the effects and results of such a plan would be. And yet, we claim that the premises laid down by us are founded on indisputable facts, and that the conclusions are logically and legitimately drawn.

Again, it may be objected to the plan on the ground that the synodical Bishop might abuse his trust; might be tyrannical in the exercise of his authority; that he might be partial. But to fear such danger is to assume that the Bishops would be incapable or unscrupulous men. Such an assumption would be an undeserved reflection on the ministry of the church. Some ministers for different reasons would not be properly qualified to attend to the duties devolving on such synodical officer. But there are many ministers, thoroughly honest and fair, just towards all men, possessed of good judgment, devoted to the welfare of the church and consecrated to the service of the Master, who unquestionably could fill such office with ability and efficiency. Many officers of our civil government are vested with authority to nominate and appoint others to offices and positions of trust. And the general rule is that capable and efficient men are appointed. Is it too much to believe that our synods would elect such ministers to the office of Bishop as would honestly, fairly, judiciously and efficiently administer the trust of selecting pastors for vacant charges? Surely not.

CONCLUSION.

Let us remember that no institution of human creation is perfect in every part; that no form of church government is complete in all its provisions, and if it were possible for us to have a perfect system of government it could not be administered perfectly, for the reason that Christian ministers and Christian people are themselves imperfect. Their knowledge is always more or less defective; their understanding not perfectly clear; their judgment never absolutely true; their feelings and will are affected by inherent selfishness and the general depravity of human nature, and hence their acts and transactions are always lacking to a greater or less extent of absolute perfection.

Hence, in order that any form of church government or any system of ecclesiastical order may be improved in its operation, it is first of all necessary that ministers of the gospel humble themselves evermore at the feet of Jesus, and consecrate themselves entirely to His service. They need to maintain an unwavering faith and firm trust in their gracious Saviour, and cultivate a spirit of true piety and faithful devotion; so that they may be able to endure hardships patiently, and, if need be, make sacrifices willingly, as faithful soldiers of the cross. And thus by their example as well as teaching, they will call forth and nurture these same Christian virtues in their people, who will then, moved by faith, love and devotion, be disposed to co-operate harmoniously with the ministry in all things pertaining to the welfare of the kingdom of Christ, including the ecclesiastical matter of selecting pastors and placing them over vacant charges.

VI.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.

BY REV. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

THE death of Cardinal Newman brought again to public attention that great movement in religious life which is commonly called the Oxford or Anglo-Catholic movement, of which he was the prime mover and the most picturesque figure. It will be my aim to tell what that movement was, give some account of the men who carried it forward, and describe its influence on the English Church.

Chief of those devout and single-minded scholars and students who, in the year 1833, commenced this campaign was John Henry Newman. Born in the second year of this century, he received evangelical training, expresses himself as much indebted to Romaine, Scott, and the other leaders of that school in the Church of England, and formed his early religious life as their pattern. Says Newman: "Scott made a deeper impression on my mind than any other. To him, humanly speaking, I almost owe my soul."* He was converted at fifteen, and of the reality of that inward change he never had any doubt. "I am still more certain of it," he says, long after he became a Roman Catholic, "than that I have hands and feet."† While at Oxford he came under the influence of Hawkins, Keble, James and others, and these men, with the studies which he was carrying on in the early church history, led him to abandon the evangelical for the Catholic standpoint. The sweet and noble attractiveness of his character, his strange personal magnetism, his calmness and self-possession united with his religious earnest-

* *Apologia pro Sua Vita*, 5th Ed., N. Y., p. 56.

† *L. c.*, p. 56.

ness and sincerity, made him before he knew it, and without his wish, the leader of the party. James Anthony Froude, who was at Oxford at the time, bears testimony to the enthusiasm with which the young men of the university crowded around him.

"Thus it was that we," says Froude, "who had never seen such another man, and to whom he appeared, perhaps, at special advantage in contrast with the normal college don, came to regard Newman with the affection of pupils (for pupils, strictly speaking, he had none) for an idolized master. The simplest word which dropped from him was treasured as if it had been an intellectual diamond. For hundreds of young men *Credo in Newmanum* was the genuine symbol of faith."*

This leadership Newman maintained until 1841, when the publication of Tract 90 obliged him to retire from Oxford. After long, profound and careful study, he became convinced that the logic of his principles led to Rome, and that the Church of England was destitute of true Catholicity, and so in 1845, at the expense of losing all he held dear, he united with the Roman Church.

Associated with him was John Keble, the gentle singer of the movement, a man of simple and beautiful piety, beloved of all who knew him, but of much narrower intellectual sympathies than his colleague. He published his *Christian Year* in 1827, and its influence on the dead religious life of England was like a moist wind on parched plants. Its exquisite music, its passionate devotion to the Lord, its freshness and variety in setting forth the doctrines of faith, its making nature the symbol of spiritual realities, the sweetness, and often plaintiveness of its strains,—a prophet in its weeping over an apostate Church, and a prophet in the sternness of its rebuke, all these qualities gave the *Christian Year* an immense power over religious minds, a power it still wields.

Newman in his *Apologia* pays a generous tribute to Keble, both as to his poetry and his general religious teaching. He

* *Good Words*, 1881. See *Library Magazine* (N. Y.) viii. 81.

thinks that the two main truths the *Christian Year* brought home to him "were the same which (he says) I have learned from [Bishop] Butler, though recast in the creative mind of my new master. The first of these was what may be called, in a large sense of the word, the sacramental system, that is, the doctrine that material phenomena are both the types and instruments of things unseen." The second principle was Keble's reinforcement by faith and love of Butler's doctrine of probability as the guide of life. Faith and love are directed to an object, in which they live. This gives it moral certainty.*

In 1833 Keble preached his famous sermon on "National Apostasy," in which he scathed the church for its worldliness, liberalism and loss of faith, and called it back to its old paths. This sermon Newman considered as the real start of the movement.

Another leader was Richard Hurrell Froude, brother of the historian, who died at the beginning of a life of golden promise. Froude was a man of exceeding earnestness of conviction, who would brook no compromises or half-way doctrines. He was withal narrow and intolerant in his spirit, and without the balance and largeness of view of Newman and Pusey. He fought the reformation tooth and nail, had a high idea of virginity and penance, and was drawn much to the mediæval church. There is no doubt that, had he lived, he would have joined Newman, Oakley, and the band who went to Rome.

After Newman's retirement Edward Bouverie Pusey became the animating mind in the new crusade. Pusey was a man of large learning, great diligence, and thorough devotion to religion. His high position as Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church gave to the movement dignity and strength. "He had vast influence in consequence of his deep religious seriousness, the munificence of his charities, his professorship, his family connections and his easy relations with the university authorities." *Apologia*, p. 107. Pusey's life-long service in the cause of Anglo-Catholicism, his literary

* *Apologia*, pp. 68, 69.

activity, and the boldness, consistency and earnestness with which he advocated his views, gave his name in after years to the movement.

There were other men who were connected with this theological uprising in the English church: Hugh James Rose, William Palmer, William George Ward, Arthur Philip Perceval, Isaac Williams, all able and notable men. Of the Oxford reformers of 1833, it can truly be said that it would be hard to find anywhere a set of men of more earnest piety, more resolute determination to serve God and the church, and a more lofty devotion to a religious ideal. They presented many points in common with the Methodist ascetics of that same university a hundred years before. They were not less serious in their lives, saw not less keenly the frivolities of the time and the worldliness of the church, and set themselves to what they considered their God-appointed tasks with no less consecrated spirit. That their ideal was not the highest, that the means by which they sought to realize it brought its own revenge in the case of many of them, that extravagances and inanities marked the development of the movement they set on foot, cannot take away from the purity of intention and grandeur of aim of that heroic band in seeking the restoration of the glories of the old Catholic church.

What did the movement mean? It bore, first, upon doctrine, and, second, upon church life. At the time at which it arose, 1830-40, liberalism was everywhere infecting both politics and theology. Sir Robert Peel had introduced his bill for the emancipation of the Catholics, which became law in 1829, a bill which was bitterly opposed by the orthodox party in the church and among the dissenters. "The whigs had come into power; Lord Grey had told the bishops to set their house in order, and some of the prelates had been insulted and threatened in the streets of London." A bill had passed the House suppressing ten of the Irish bishoprics (1833), a terrible blow to men who believed in the divine order of the episcopate and its indefectible gifts. The monarchy had been overturned in France in 1830 by

a bloodless revolution and Charles X had to take refuge in England. The clergy of the Episcopal church were worldly and selfish, at ease in Zion, having perished the godly simplicity of the old evangelicals. No doubt there were many honorable exceptions, but Gieseler, speaking of this period, says that "zeal for religion and the church died out almost entirely. Divine service conducted by hirelings degenerated in a lifeless mechanism."* An Episcopal authority of the present day gives a like testimony. "The services were decent and decorous; the bishops prosperous and good-natured; the preaching ethical and worldly wise; and the nation in a comfortable, religious slumber."† And Sydney Smith said to Gladstone in 1835, "Whenever you meet a clergyman of my time, you may be sure he is a bad clergyman." ‡ Newman, fresh from his reading in the first ages of the church, could not but feel that the glory had indeed departed from Israel. "With the establishment thus divided and threatened," he says, "thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh, vigorous power of which I was reading in the first centuries. In her triumphant zeal in behalf of that Primeval Mystery to which I had so great a devotion from my youth, I recognized the movement of my spiritual mother. '*Incessu patuit Dea.*' The self-conquest of her ascetics, the patience of her martyrs, the irresistible determination of her bishops, the joyous swing of her advance, both exalted and abashed me. I said to myself, "Look on this picture and on that." I felt affection for my own church, but not tenderness; I felt dismay at her prospects, anger and scorn at her do-nothing perplexity. I thought that if liberalism once got footing within her, it was sure of the victory in the event. I saw the reformation principles were powerless to rescue her. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination;

* See Gieseler, *Church History*, translation Smith and Robinson, V., p. 472.

† Rev. Julius H. Ward, "The Oxford movement in the English Church," in *Andover Review*, July, 1889, p. 62.

‡ Wilfrid Meynell, "Cardinal Newman and his Contemporaries," in *Contemporary Review*, Sep., 1890.

still I ever kept before me that there was something greater than the established church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set us from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and organ. She was nothing unless she was this. She must be dealt with strongly, or she would be lost. There was need of a second reformation." *

This reformation the Oxford reformers proceeded to inaugurate. They first preached the supremacy of dogma. The doctrines defined in the ecumenical creeds were given by the church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, and must be received. Dogma is the foundation of religion. Any departure from the Dogmatic structure of the old Catholic church is soul-destroying heresy. Second, based on this foundation they taught that there was a "visible church with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace." The Holy Ghost is given in ordination; confession and absolution is recognized in the visitation service in the Prayer Book; the baptismal service teaches the regeneration of the infant; and the sacramental service gives "verily the body and blood of Christ." The rites and doctrines of the ancient church were to be restored in their full power, believed in and solemnly celebrated by the clergy, according to the teaching and implication of the Prayer Book. The august mysteries of the faith were not to be emptied of their consolation and fulness by an unbelieving ministry. The English church professed to be in harmony with antiquity. Let her not, then, sacrifice the truths for which the martyrs died at the bidding of a cold and faithless liberalism. Third, the Oxford reformers exalted the bishop. The bishop was the representative of Christ's authority. The bishop was pope. Clerical discipline should be restored. The bishops should assert their rights in the fear of God and for the purity of the church. Fourth, the church of God existed in three forms, the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican, all having the apostolic succession and the note of Catholicity. The Anglican branch could fully maintain her

**Apologia*, p. 80.

place as to the Church Catholic, and with the advantage over Rome of having kept the apostles' doctrine in a much purer form. What is needed is to bring the English church into the full realization of her Catholic position, and in her teaching, ceremonies and discipline to act in harmony with her professed principles.*

As to the Christian life and worship, the effort was made to make solemn, stately and beautiful the services of the sanctuary, and bring the architecture of the church and the performance of the various parts of the worship in conformity with the mystery, spirit and honor due to the divine glory. Fasting, abstraction from worldly duties, holiness of life, humility and purity, were insisted on as essential to the priest.

Such was the Oxford Movement of 1833, the most important religious upheaval of the English-speaking world in this century. It was made possible by the complex character of the English Church, the Catholic and Protestant elements being equally present in her constitution. Her Articles of Religion have a strong Protestant flavor; but her Prayer Book and her Homilies, which are also her legal documents, give full play to Catholic principles. Newman and Pusey stood squarely on these latter charters, called themselves the successors of her illustrious fathers, Bramhall, Hooker, whose *Ecclesiastical Polity* was edited by Keble, Laud, Taylor, Jackson, Wall, and the Catholic party of the seventeenth century. They republished the works of these English Churchmen under the title of the *Anglo-Catholic Library*. And inasmuch as the English Church made it her boast against Rome that she was true to the doctrines and discipline of the early Catholic Church, they made constant appeal to the Fathers, printed extracts from them in their Tracts, and started in 1838 the *Library of the Fathers*, which published forty-six volumes of the early Christian literature. It is my deliberate opinion that, with the exception

* In *Apologia*, pp. 95-103, Newman gives the platform which guided the movement in its beginning. His remarks on the Church of Rome are especially interesting.

of individual vagaries and the extremes to which in some cases the doctrines were put, the Tractarians occupied a position historically tenable as English Churchmen. The High Church school is as legitimate a development of some of her principles as is the Broad or Low Church schools. The English Church, with the true instinct of a catholic and historic Church, seeks for comprehension; the recent denominations, with the impatience and narrowness of sects, seek for excision of all things not in harmony with the majority.

The results of this Movement have been most potent. The earnestness and devotion of these men were rewarded. Their teachings found congenial soil and took root. Their Tracts (ninety in all, published from 1833 to 1841) were circulated far and wide, and left in almost every parsonage in England. In his essay on the "Prospects of the Anglican Church," Newman collects several testimonies as to the spread of their doctrines. Baden-Powell is quoted as follows: "It is clear from published authorities, that opinions and views of theology (of at least a very marked and peculiar kind, applying more especially to the subject of Church authority and others dependent on it), have been extensively adopted and strenuously applied, and are daily gaining ground among a considerable and influential portion of the members, as well as ministers of the Established Church." Bishop Sumner refers to the subject as "daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect." Another author says:

"They (the Church doctrines) have indeed already made fearful progress in different parts of the country, and are now making rapid progress where they were before unknown. One of the largest churches in Brighton is crowded every Sunday to hear these doctrines preached by the Rev. Mr. Anderson; so is the church of Dr. Hook, in Leeds. In fact there are few towns of note to which they have not extended; nay, they have reached obscure and insignificant places in the remotest parts of the kingdom. They are preached in small towns of Scotland. They obtain in Elginshire, which is six hundred miles north of London; and I found them myself in the heart of the

Highlands of Scotland, when traveling there three months ago."*

These doctrines in the main are now the ruling tradition in the Anglican Church. They control the utterances of her bishops; the deliverances of the last Pan-Anglican Council were in harmony with this tradition; and the attitude of the Episcopal Church to other communions is due to the same cause. The Evangelical and Broad Church schools exist and are influential, but the High Church school, which takes the substantial ground of the Oxford reformers, holds the reins.

The influence of this school in religious life has been profound. The churches become once more crowded with worshippers. Early services, missions or revival meetings, retreats or special seasons for devotion, the weekly administration of the Lord's Supper, more power and earnestness in preaching, all have characterized the spread of these principles. The English Church has had a marvelous energy in spiritual and missionary development within the last fifty years, and it has been largely due to the tremendous earnestness of the High Church clergy. This is acknowledged on all hands. Professor Lacroix, in the article, "Oxford Tracts," in the *McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia*, says that "with all its narrowness and errors, it has infused an entirely new spiritual life into what was once the very staid and cold life of the High Church party in the Church of England. It has also in the same way affected the Protestant Episcopal Church in America." The Rev. James W. White, of Wisconsin, in some excellent articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oberlin, O.), for October, 1889, and January, 1890, on the "Anglo-Catholic Movement," says: "To read the history of the condition of practical religion, both among the clergy and laity half a century or more ago, and then compare it with the present in the districts where the new Anglican ideas prevail, is sufficient to convince any candid mind that the Oxford Movement has been in a true sense a

* Newman, *Essays, Historical and Critical*, 8th Edition, Vol. I., pp. 264, 265.

revival of religion as well as of ecclesiasticism" (January, pp. 95, 96). He also says that "the Oxford revival must be regarded as having had a leading share in the unprecedented advance of the Anglican church in recent times" (p. 97). Mrs. Ward, with fine appreciation, has sketched one of the High Church clergy in the character of Newcome in *Robert Elsmere*. With such burning earnestness as his have these men carried their sacramental Gospel to the slums of the Christian city and to the wilds of the heathen lands. But recently the world has done homage to one of this school when the news was sent forth of the death of Canon Liddon, the splendor of whose eloquence in his historic temple was the fitting expression of a singularly pure and exalted type of Christian manhood and the fitting vehicle of the great truths of the Gospel of Christ, which, with the positiveness and precision of a robust and fearless faith, were given forth from that illustrious pulpit.

I have not space to point out the defects of this Movement. By placing the authority of doctrine on the law of the church instead of on the individual reason and conscience enlightened by the Holy Spirit, you drive men either to scepticism or Rome. The integrity of the soul cannot be given over into the hands of tradition and the past. While the past is full of lessons of the highest value, and while the doctrinal attainments of the Church are to be considered with reverent and docile attention, the final appeal is to be made to the judgment of the believer informed by the Word of God and the Spirit which verifies that Word in the experience. It is not indeed to be charged as a defect of the Movement that the liberalism which Newman and his men dreaded and fought they did not drive from the English church. But this failure has indeed been the fact. The power of a living and spiritual, as opposed to a dogmatic and sacramentarian theology, has never been so active and strenuous as since the days of the Oxford Tracts. At the very moment when Newman was leaving Oxford, that University was nurturing the men who should break the shackles of the Puseyites. While the Tractarian movement, by its ardor

and holy zeal, was bringing many into the church, by its narrowness and fierce ritualism it was driving many out. The same tide which would have borne Richard Hurrell Froude into the Roman Church, had he lived long enough, and which made John Henry Newman the prince of Roman controversialists, landed the younger Froude and the elder Newman on the shores of scepticism. It was a game of profit and loss. Better than the position of either is the stand of him who keeps his spiritual vision undimmed to behold the glory and the truth of God in the face of Jesus Christ, his reason untrammelled to weigh all the doctrines of men, and his soul independent of all masters save One. And this is the very essence of Evangelicalism: the Word of God is the only rule of faith; the heart is the seat of religion and the chief organ of religious knowledge; and the Christian consciousness guided by the Word and Spirit of God is the verifier and test of dogma.*

The Anglo-Catholic Movement has a mission, however, in the Divine Providence which watches over the history of the church. It was an effort to realize the continuity and majesty of a Catholic Church and of Catholic truth. "There are few who will not acknowledge," says the late Principal Tulloch, of the Church of Scotland, a most impartial critic of this Movement, "that the Oxford Movement has done more than all other movements in our time to revive the grandeur of and grace of historical communion and church life, and no less the true place of beauty and art in worship. It is much to have brought home to the hearts of Christian people the reality of a great spiritual society extending through all Christian ages, living by its own truth and life, having its own laws and rights and usages. In a time when the dissidence of dissent and the canker of sectarianism have spread to the very heart of our

* The reader will find some excellent remarks on the meaning and place of the Evangelical Revival in the progress of theology and its influence on the doctrinal unity of the churches, as well as on the Tractarian Reaction in relation to it, in the lecture by Professor George R. Crooks, of Drew Theological Seminary, delivered in the Boston Monday Lectureship, and published in the volume, *Christ and Modern Thought* (Boston and London, 1882).

national existence, with so many unhappy results, the idea of a church as a vast unity—and no less the idea of Christian art—of the necessity of order and beauty in Christian worship—are ideas to be thankful for. That both these ideas are capable, as history proves, of rapid abuse, unless interpenetrated by the light of reason, and used with purity of heart, is no ground for rejecting either. It is the very function of Christian sense to hold the balance of truth, and by proving all things, to hold fast that which is good.”*

LITERATURE.—Newman, *Apologia pro Sua Vita* (London, 1864, often reprinted), written with the utmost simplicity and candor, and with all the charms of clearness, directness and purity of style with which its author is master. Newman, *Essays, Critical and Historical* (London, 1871; 8th Edition, 1888), Essays VII., VIII., X., XVI. Mozley, Rev. T., brother-in-law to Newman, *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement* (London and Boston, 1884). Ward, Wilfrid, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1889). These are the chief works. Estimates of Newman, or of his co-workers, or of the Movement in one or more of its phases, will be found in Stanley's *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (see Index); Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce's *Life of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce*, Chapters IV., VII., VIII., XIII.; Stoughton's *History of Religion in England*, last volume; Gieseler's *Church History*, last volume, and articles without number in the theological reviews. The recently published *Correspondence of Newman while in the English Church* (London and New York, 1891) does not add materially to our knowledge of the Movement. But another book published since the above article was written, *The Oxford Movement, 1833-1845*, by the late lamented Dean R. W. Church (London and New York, 1891), ought by all means to be consulted.

* *Movements of Religious Thought in Great Britain*, Ch. III., end.

VII.

THE COMING IDEAL CHURCH.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

It is not proposed to write concerning the coming ideal Baptist Church, or Episcopal Church, or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Reformed Church. If it were, all we would be required to do would be to make a thorough study of the best parts of the standards of doctrines, rules of discipline, and distinctive characteristics, of the church chosen to be written about, and picture out a church that comes nearest to the fulfillment of their spirit and teaching. We purpose, however, to present some thoughts in regard to the coming ideal Church irrespective of denominational conceptions of what such should be. Our view, therefore, is to sweep beyond any denominational horizon.

I. Consider first, the coming ideal Church as to *organization*.

'Tis true the Church of Christ in its real and ultimate essence is not necessarily an organization: it dates antecedently to and independently of any organization. In the sense of a *spiritual* power, working in the hearts of the believers, "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven,"—which Christ declared to be "in" the believer,* and Paul speaks of as not being "meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost"† is the real Church in its ultimate essence; and as such is not an organization. "The invisible and the spiritual is the vital force, the moulding power, the in-

* Luke 17: 20, 21.

† Rom. 14: 17.

fallible security for the continuance and ultimate completeness of the visible,—just as the seed is the vitality of the tree, as the leaven works in and assimilates the meal with which it is incorporated, as the vine-stock sustains the vine from which the non-fruitful branches are expurgd.”*

We speak here, however, of the visible Church, which, in the providence of God, as well as by a natural course of historically religious affairs, when she grew into power and extension, tended to organization. And as in the past, so in the future, the Church will necessarily tend toward visible self-organization. Dr. Van Dyke in this connection well says: “Because the Holy Catholic Church consists of all those throughout the world who profess the true religion, some have hastily inferred that the visibility of the Church is nothing more than the visibility of the individuals who belong to it, and that its unity is merely an ideal aggregation of its members. They might as well say that because a city or State consists of the whole number of its inhabitants, therefore it is nothing more than an imaginary collection of those who are born or adopted into it. The United States of America consists of sixty millions of people, therefore these people are the United States; and since their unity depends ultimately upon their opinions and sentiments, their unity is altogether inward and invisible. This reasoning, which is manifestly absurd when applied to a kingdom of this world, is no less so when applied to the kingdom of Christ. Citizenship necessarily implies an organized State. The professing Christian is ‘no longer a stranger and foreigner, but a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God.’ A member of the Church, as the name implies, is a part of a body, which, though it has many members, is one body.”†

But let us ask, what will the organization of the coming ideal Church be? Will it be one great hierarchical body with a central head, and an ordered succession and gradation of

* H. J. Van Dyke, D.D., “The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments,” p. 43.

† “The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments,” p. 48.

officers? Will it be a doing away with all denominations, massing the great body of believers and adherents of Christianity into one permanently organized body-religion? * Will that be the ideal Church? Not to say a word about the necessity, should that be attempted, of changing entirely the spirit and nature of Protestantism, whose genius is not in the line of manipulating and governing people in one great mass, as is the nature and power of Roman Catholicism, it would be necessary to change the entire course of the history of the Church, which always has been, and doubtless will be, subject to variations according to the changing conditions of society.

Dr. A. A. Hodge has written: "The permanent results of biblical interpretation unite with the history of Christ's providential and gracious guidance of the churches in proving that He never intended to impose upon the Church as a whole any particular form of organization. Neither He nor His apostles ever went beyond the suggestion of general principles and actual inauguration of a few rudimentary forms."† These forms have always taken shape and course according to the development of time and of historical conditions "resulting from national character, and from political, social, educational, and geographical circumstances." Hence it would be but a waste of time to speculate as to the form which the organization of the coming ideal Church will assume. As long as human nature remains as it is, and Providence continues to work as it does, we cannot look for the ideal Church to come in a process by which all believers are to be absorbed into one great body, to be called *the Church*. There are differences of tasks, of education, of conditions, of peoples, of habits of thought and life, and as long as these remain there will be differences in the ways in which people will prefer to conduct their worship and to live the non-essentials of Christianity in the world; and we believe it to be true that "a time can never come when many of these

* "The time for world-empires, whether of the Church or the State, is past."—Vandyke, "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 71.

† "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes," p. 304.

differences, so evidently designed, will be obliterated." * They need not necessarily in order to have unity. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who worketh all things in all." † Uniformity is not more necessary to constitute unity in the Church than in Nature. "All living unity implies diversity; and just in proportion to the elevated type and significance of the unity will be the variety of the elements it comprehends. In the barren desert each grain of sand is of precisely the same form with every other grain, and therefore there is no organic whole. The life of the world results from the correlation of earth and sky, of land and sea, of mountains and plains," not at all uniform, yet one grand unity. "All social unity springs out of the differences between man and woman, parent and child, men of thought and men of action, the men who possess and the men who need. No number of similar stones would constitute a great Cathedral. No number of repetitions of the same musical sound would generate music. Always where the most profound and perfect unity is effected it is the result of the greatest variety and complexity of parts." ‡ The true life of the coming ideal Church will be a unity resulting from the correlation of the accidental differences between the various denominations that are one in essen-

* Of course, it is not meant that people are at liberty to adopt any form or manner of worship that their tastes or education or habit of thought or life may lead them to do irrespective of the teachings of the Scriptures. "The church is to be governed by principles laid down in the Word of God, which determine, within certain limits, her officers and mode of organization; but beyond these prescribed principles and in fidelity to them, the church has a wide discretion in the choice of methods, organs and agencies. * * * * Christ in His infinite wisdom has left His church free to modify her government, in accordance with these principles, as may suit her circumstances in different ages and nations."—Charles Hodge, D.D., "Polity of the Church," p. 277.

† 1 Cor. 12: 4-6, R. V.

‡ Dr. A. A. Hodge, "Popular Lectures," pp. 306, 307.

tials.* And is it not safe to say with Dr. A. A. Hodge that "undoubtedly a time is soon coming when the law of differentiation so long dominant, shall be subordinated to the law of integration, when all these differences so arduously won shall be wrought into the harmony of the perfect whole"? May God speed that day! It should be the great object of those especially filling places of leadership in the Church to do their utmost by precept and example to cultivate the real union of the churches by "promoting the central spiritual unity of the Church which comprehends them all. For this end all who call themselves Christians must with one purpose seek to bring their whole mind and thought more and more into perfect conformity to the word of God speaking through the Sacred Scriptures, and their whole life and activity more and more into subjection to the Holy Ghost dwelling in the whole body and in all its members alike." We have reason to rejoice in the "signs of the times" in this regard. For it is true, as Dr. Van Dyke has said: "The unity of Christendom—a unity that the world can see, and be convinced by it that the Father has sent His only begotten Son—is to-day a longing in the hearts and a prayer on the lips of multitudes of Christians."†

* "The unity of the Church can be effected only by a vital power dwelling in every part and common to all. That power can be none other than the Holy Spirit. * * * * The unification of Christian denominations must be attained by bringing out into clearer recognition and adjusting to new relations that which is already in them. The first stage in this process is the practical acknowledgment that the things in which they agree, whether in doctrine, discipline, or worship, are not only more important in their bearing, but more and greater in themselves than the things in which they differ. * * * * Beginning on a small scale, and embracing at first only the subdivisions of sects, holding the same system of doctrine and order, and separated by distinctions as small as the difference between a psalm and a hymn, or between the sound of a pitch pipe and the swell of an organ, who shall say that it will not enlarge its circumference and intensify its assimilating power until it includes the Christian world in its embrace. It is easy to sit in the seat of the polemic, surmising difficulties and predicting failures; but it is far nobler to hope for and hasten unto the blessed time when out of many folds there shall be one flock and one Shepherd."—H. J. Van Dyke, D.D., "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," pp. 71, 72, 73.

† "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 65.

But now the question arises, How is that unity to come? That is, what form is it to assume?

We do not believe that the Church to become thus ideally a unity need destroy all denominationalism, and become uniform in worship and religious habits, any more than an army to become ideally a unity need destroy all its divisions or regiments, and the soldiers be thrown together in one great uniform mass. The ideal Church does not call for less denominationalism, but for more love and sympathy and co-operation and confederation and confidence among the denominations.*

The ideal church will be an organized denominationalism, just as the ideal army is a body of organized regiments, showing a unity of spirit and effort, and of prayers and of hopes.† Not envious of, or at strife with each other, impeding the progress of the forces moving against a common enemy, by quarrels, and by one regiment aiming its guns and bayonets at the other, but with all guns and bayonets pointing in one straight line at the enemy. Give us this latter and the enemy will soon

*"Men cannot and ought not to renounce their personal convictions of truth. If you should dissolve all Christian denominations to-day, it would create not union, but anarchy. If you should renounce all creeds, the result would be, not a broader faith, but a confusion of tongues."—Van Dyke, "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 66.

† Should this be the case, and wherever it is the case, is it not the fulfillment of the prayer of Christ, when He prayed for the unity of believers? (John 17: 21), and by such a unity would not the world be able to see, and seeing, be constrained to believe in the divine mission of the Saviour? The question is often asked; Can this prayer be fulfilled without an incorporated, organic union of all denominations into one body? Originally, no doubt, such was the case in the Church of Christ. But, with the development of time is such possible now? Dr. A. B. Bruce has this to say in answer to such a question: "In our day incorporating union on a great scale is not possible, and other methods of expressing the feelings of Catholicity must be resorted to (*"The Training of the Twelve,"* p. 460); and then suggests that the method of confederation might be tried. "But whatever may be thought of that," he continues, "one thing is certain, that the unity of believers in Christ must be made more manifest as an undeniable fact somehow, if the Church is to realize her vocation as a holy nation called out of darkness to show forth the virtue of Him whose name she bears, and win for Him the world's homage and faith."—(*Idem.*)

be conquered. A Greek general, standing upon an eminence from which he could see the whole army of hostile troops, cried out to his soldiers: "Men, courage! Victory is ours! for I see that the spears in the files of the enemy are not in line. The ranks yonder are so illy trained that their weapons will become sources of suicide before the sun shall set." Keep your spears in line, Oh! various regiments of the Church of Christ, and victory is yours! Satan wants nothing better than to stir up strife among denominations; he's safe then, and what is more can then easily lead the people of God captive. Just as were two boys who were treed by a vicious bull-dog.* Comrades chancing to come by, were hailed to the rescue. A whole regiment of boys, however, would not have been sufficient to remove Tiger from his watch. But the shrewdness of a boy soon came into play. A vicious bull was grazing in an adjoining field. Stealthily the boys crept up to the gate between fields, and with a crashing noise let down the bars. The bull, hearing the noise, came to see what it meant, and, finding the bars down, of course, entered the next field. "Holler! Holler at Tige! Set him barkin'! that will make the bull come. Then you'll see fun; and you can get away, too," shouted the comrades to the prisoners. The dog barked furiously, and the bull went to see what had interested Tiger. Soon the dust flew amid bellowing and barking. The boys in the tree were entirely forgotten by the brutes in the interest they had in a battle of their own, and soon reached the ground. They stood at a safe distance in great glee watching the fight. And splendid umpires did they make! At last, fearing that the bull would be killed or the dog die, the boys prepared to stop the fight. They saw that both brutes were exhausted, and that themselves had little to fear; so they got immense whips and sticks and began to whip the dog and beat the Bull to separate them. Both animals were powerless, if not without courage; and beneath whip and stick the tired creatures separated and were driven each to his home. And each one seemed to wonder at

* Related by the Rev. J. A. Davis in *Christian Intelligencer*.

the mastery gained over him by the boys. The Church of to-day but too often, alas! alas! has no more sense and shrewdness than these brutes; her branches, at the instigation of Satan, attacking each other, and thus let his Satanic majesty free to lead her captive. Knowing that he could not conquer her himself, he sets the denominations fighting each other, till, all exhausted and weary, he can easily gain victory over her. The coming ideal Church will have sense enough not to let the devil down from the tree by her internecine wars. "One thing seems clear—that the unification of the Church cannot be accomplished by one denomination working upon another from without.* Proselytism, whether by argument or persuasion, is a waste of time and strength. The converts made by such means are far-fetched and little worth." †

II. Look further at the coming ideal Church as to *membership*.

1. *First of all as to purpose, aim and ultima thule of all their work.*—This will not be so much the swelling of membership rolls, so as to make good showings in "Church news" columns of religious papers, at Associations and Conventions, and Presbyteries, and Classes, and Synods, as the true conversion of people from meanness of character, and sinfulness of heart and awakening in their life and conduct noble, Christ-like impulses. Nor will it be a gathering into the Church merely those who wear gold rings and goodly apparel, and who live in fine stone-front homes of our fashionable up-town communities, whose religion consists mainly in driving in glitter-

* Dr. Bruce (*Training of the Twelve*, p. 461) says that the prayer of Jesus in John 17 "plainly conveys the truth that without unity the Church can neither glorify Christ, commend Christianity as divine, nor have the glory of Christ abiding on herself. . . . Wrangling is not a divine thing, and it needs no divine influence to bring it about. Any body can quarrel; and the world, knowing that, has little respect for a quarreling Church. But the world opens its eyes in wonder at a community in which peace and concord prevail, saying: Here is something out of the common course—selfishness and self-will rooted out of human nature—nothing but a divine influence could thus subdue the centrifugal forces which tend to separate men from each other."

† H. J. Van Dyke, D.D., "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 71.

ing equipages to the Sabbath morning service and pay large pew rents, while the poor who live in squalor and in crime in tenement rows are left to their sad fate; but it will be a providing a common church home for all alike who desire to worship God.

2. *As to reasons for being members.*—This will not be because they had reasoned out upon a basis of utilitarianism that it is safest to be in the Church, and hence make religion a place of personal refuge; or because they had been driven to the Lord, having had awakened in them "the trembling of a craven spirit in anticipation of tortures;" but because they are religious for religion's sake, and have been driven to the Saviour because there had been awakened in them the agonies of a nobler spirit "in the horrors of *being evil*;" and with impulses of love urging them to deeds of mercy and kindness. They will not then be those whose fellow-feeling ends in mere sentimental pity, that doles out a dollar or two to the poor and suffering as a bone is thrown in sheer compassion to a hungry dog; not those "who sigh for wretchedness, yet shun the wretched, nursing in some delicious solitude 'Their dainty loves and slothful sympathies;'" nor those who are but "dreaming contemplatists," who are always sighing and looking for conditions of greater ease and pleasure; but it will be those who make sorrow smile, dry the tears of grief and sadness bedewing the pale, pinched cheek of humanity, and smooth dying pillows. They will, further, be those who believe, and then act upon the belief, that "the best Christian is not the one who *longs* most for heaven, but the one who is doing the most to transform the hearts and lives and homes of men into heaven;" and who realize that "there is something better than singing hymns of Beulah-land above, the Sweet By and By, and quoting texts from the gates and walls of the New Jerusalem," knowing that that something is "revealing the celestial song in a godly, busy life"; and, again, those who know that "heaven comes now and will be fully unveiled to those who gain it by fidelity everywhere and always in the conquest of the Redeemer."

3. *As to exemplification of practical Christianity.*—The membership of the coming ideal Church will consist of people whose religion at home and in business will be just as good and true and transparent as in the church service, or at prayer-meeting. A boy of a church member of the coming ideal Church will not have occasion to say, as did one to a railway conductor when asked his age: "At home I'm always twelve, but mother says I'm only ten in the cars." In the ideal Church there will not be the scene described in the "*Sunday-School Times*," where a slovenly carpenter was once heard at a weekly prayer-meeting to pray with great fervency for the spread of Christ's cause—a cause which he disgraced and hindered in his sphere every time he stood at his work-bench. When he ended his prayer a hearty "Amen" came from a servant who put her mistress out of temper a hundred times a day by her carelessness. A clerk also was there, who, although he taught a class in the mission-school on Sundays, was always late at his employer's store week-days. He whispered "Amen" too—and meant it, so far as he knew himself. A lady hearer, as she listened, resolved to join the Church missionary society, and then went home and found unreasonable fault with her cook. And others also felt warmed to do something for Christ who never seemed to have thought that religion, like charity, begins at home.

The membership of the coming ideal Church will be different from that of a father concerning whom his boy answered when asked: "Is your father a Christian?" "Yes, sir, but you can't tell it on him; he ain't working at it lately, neither."

The membership of the coming ideal Church will be such as will make religion "glorified morality, and morals realized religion;" such as will know that it is an absurdity for any man to have "his heart full of loyal affection and devotion to God as an individual while engaged in private business, and then be perfectly oblivious of the existence and of the claims of God as soon as he begins to act politically as a citizen of the State;" clasping hands with the political tricksters, sharing the profits

with the "boodlers," being hail-fellow-well-met with the liquor traffic by giving it his moral support by voting for its men, even though it be on the plea that they happen to be the men of the party with which he is connected. It will be a membership loyal to the King of Kings in whatever capacity or in whatever circumstances they may be placed.

4. *As to willingness to work.*—The membership of the coming ideal Church will be such as is willing to work with large-hearted charity,—working for Christ either in personal ministrations, or by gifts for the cause,—and working not for the outrivalling of their neighbors, in outward show, but who are willing to work for the upbuilding of Christ's glorious kingdom in the growth of grace in the hearts of believers, "till they all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that they may be no longer children tosed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking the truth (or dealing truly) in love may grow up in all things unto Him, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth according to the working in due measure of each several part maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."*

5. And once more. Dr. Pierson predicts that the coming Church, as far as work for the extension of Christ's kingdom is concerned, will be essentially a missionary Church distinctively educating her membership to intelligent and systematic participation in the work of witnessing to all men. "No member will be in good standing who takes no part in this loyal obedience to Christ's last command." He suggests further, that each church will have a double pastorate, one at home and one abroad, "the support of both provided for as equally a part of the financial administration of the church;" and adds: "We see no reason why denominations should not act in concert to promote great

* Eph. 4: 13-16, R. V.

common ends, and save all the needless outlay now involved in separate action and administration." *

III. Consider, thirdly, the coming ideal Church as to the *ministry*.

1. The ministry must be thoroughly equipped *intellectually*.

Why? For the following manifest reasons :

(a) Because the ages are growing more and more intellectual ; and this must be so the more pure Christianity is disseminated.

Dr. James Freeman Clark has well said : "Christianity blossoms out into modern science, literature, art,—children who, indeed, often forget their mother and are ignorant of their source, but which are still fed from her breasts and partake of her life. Christianity, the spirit of faith, hope and love, is the deep fountain of modern civilization. Its inventions are for the many, not for the few. Its science is not hoarded, but diffused. It elevates the masses who everywhere else have been trampled down. The friend of the people, it tends to free schools, a free press, a free government, the abolition of slavery, war, vice and the melioration of society." †

He who would essay to lead the people in their religious worship and thought must, therefore, of necessity be, to say the least, abreast of them, if not in advance. 'Tis, however, a question how far the preacher is called upon to go in the way of intellectual preaching. People truly do not go to the house of God on the Sabbath day to hear abstract essays on worldly science and philosophy, and "culture" as it is called in our

* *The Missionary Review of the World*, Oct., 1891, p. 725. The above excerpts are taken from Dr. Pierson's characteristic article on *The Coming Age of Missions*, in which are found many excellent hints as to what the coming Church, if she attains to the true spirit of her Master, must develop into, not only in the line of work abroad but also at home, expressing deep solicitude "to see the Church taking up the cause of the Master as though there were faith in His leadership and confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Gospel. . . . The world waits and He waits for a new spirit of thorough surrender to His will, and for a new epoch of enterprise in missions. How long shall this waiting of ages be in vain?"

† "Ten Great Religions," Vol. I, p. 30, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1883.

day; but they come to sit beneath the droppings of the sanctuary to have their souls refreshed and purified by a simple, clear, practical gospel, such as Jesus preached in the Sermon on the Mount and at Jacob's well, and to the multitudes that sat on Judean slopes to hear it. There is significant suggestion in what Dr. Theodore Cuyler relates concerning one of his first congregations. He writes: "During my first ministry in a suburban town I had in my little congregation a very distinguished lawyer for a part of each year. He once said to me: 'The two things I want are simplicity in preaching and downright earnestness. My brain is taxed all through the week with the exacting labors of my profession, and I do not come to God's house to have it taxed again with any intricate questions; I come here simply to be made a better man.'"

People surely do not and never will, no matter what the intellectuality of the world may become, want their ministers to undertake the useless task of arming themselves with "sling and stone, and go forth to meet the Lilliputian Goliaths who defy the armies of the living God." They truly do not and never will expect them to grapple with and unfold the categories of Kant and the vague philosophy of Hegel, that resulted in the idealism of a Fichte, landing at last in the nescience and agnosticism of a Spencer of to-day. They certainly do not and never will ask them to spend the sacred time in the pulpit in attempts to explain and combat the ever-varying destructive, unsettled and unsettling biblical criticism of a Tübingen-school type on the New Testament, and that of a Wellhausen and Kuenen, echoed by a Robertson Smith and a Briggs on the Old Testament. They, indeed, do not and never will care to have them enter upon the useless task of expounding the Positive Philosophy and Mr. Herbert Spencer's system of the universe, "developed from the unknowable," and his new theory of creation under Darwin's law of development." Nor would they now or ever have them "follow Tyndal and Huxley and Darwin into the *penetralia* of nature and expose the missing links in their theories of the origin of man and of the universe,

and trudge with Sir John Lubbock over his immeasurable mud-bank of facts, often falsely so called, or grope their way with Baron Gould through his immeasurable fog-banks of speculation touching the genesis of man and his religions." *

The people are, 'tis true, and 'tis as blessed as true, interested in scientific discussions when conducted in their time and place, and such discussions are very valuable; but worn and weary with the week's burdens and cares they do not come to a church on the Lord's Day to listen to them. And after all the fact is that very few outside of the specialists know much about the technicalities of scientific and philosophic discussion and can understand little of it all. Who, for example, can understand Herbert Spencer's definition of evolution, when he says that it "is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations." What does that mean? Who knows? Who particularly cares? The best elucidation of this language, and as Dr. Gregory says, "bringing out the precise scientific import in the most intelligible form," † was given by a keen critic as follows: "Evolution is a change from a no-howish untalk-aboutable all-alikeness, to a somehowish and in-general-talk-aboutablenot-all-alikeness, by a continuous something-elsifications and-stick-togetherations."

A minister was in the midst of a series of scholarly Sabbath discourses on Huxley, Tyndal, Darwin and Spencer,—in no way disturbing the peace or affecting the reputation of these specialists by his generalities, almost, if not altogether meaningless,—when one of his members came to him and said: "My dear pastor, please preach to us Christ and Him crucified; we

* Dr. Stuart Robinson wrote in the January, 1879, *Princeton Review*: "Every minister of intelligence has discovered that the most effective method of destroying the influence of error over the minds of men is not to give chase after it into the wilderness of controversy, but to instill into the minds of the people clear and distinct ideas of the contrary truth. The surest antidote to falsehood is clear-cut simple statement of the positive truth which falsehood assails."

† The "*Princeton Review*," Sept., 1878, p. 435.

don't know anything about the men concerning whom you are preaching, and what is more we don't care to know anything about them; our salvation does not depend upon them; it does depend upon Jesus our Saviour; we long to know of Him: tell us of Him who saves us."* Ah! yes, 'tis Christ we all want to know, and the Christian soul says:

"Tell me about the Master,
Of the wrongs He freely forgave;
Of His love and tender compassion,
Of His love that was mighty to save;
For my heart is weary, weary
Of the woes and temptations of life,
Of the error that stalks in the noonday,
Of falsehood and malice and strife.

Yet I know that whatever sorrow
Or pain or temptation befall,
The Infinite Master hath suffered
And knoweth and pitieth all.
So tell me the sweet old story
That falls on each wound like a balm,
And my heart that was bruised and broken,
Shall grow patient and strong and calm."

What is needed, then, is a ministry whose intellectuality will not consist in merely being able to write erudite discourses on abstract subjects, but who will combine in their preaching a practical, intense, lively, earnest, simple, spiritually-minded presentation of the Gospel, with a full appreciation of and ability in the learning of the day.

c) The ministry must be fully equipped intellectually, also because the cause demands it.

What subjects we have to deal with! God! Immortality! The Atonement! Salvation of the Soul! Plans of Redemption!

* "My one great comprehensive answer then to the question, What is the best method of dealing in the pulpit with popular skepticism? is really this: make known and real to men by every means you can command the personal Christ, not doctrine about Him, but Him; strike at the tyranny of the physical life by the power of His spiritual presence." Phillips Brooks, D. D., in *Princeton Review*, March, 1879, p. 307.

can a weak intellect, or an untrained mind cope with these subjects in any way satisfactorily as a leader of the people in matters pertaining to them?

And further, do we entrust our sick bodies to the care of uneducated, unskilled, untrained physicians? Shall people entrust their sick and dying souls to the care of untrained, un-intellectual pastors?

2. But coupled with this high degree of intellectuality there must be a high degree of spirituality. The ideal ministry will be thoroughly endued with power from on high; fully consecrated to the service of God in saving souls; highly spiritually-minded; living constantly close to the heart of Jesus Christ the loving Master;—the intellectuality spoken of above warmed, made all aglow with attractiveness by a high spirituality. For, unless the intellect is prompted by and filled with spirituality in religion, the latter is unsatisfactory and very incomplete. Attractive to the eye such may be, but chilling to the touch and life, just as is the faultless statuary in our art galleries.

3. But take another trait that will be conspicuous in the ministry of the coming church, viz., *sincerity*.

In that church we will not hear charges that are but all too boldly made against the clergy of to-day, in many quarters that they are not sincere; that they have not the courage of their convictions, and dare not speak out their full minds, either on doctrinal or practical subjects, for fear of losing their places and popularity; that they are afraid to utter the whole counsel of God, plain, unvarnished, practical truth; that by many of them creeds are privately discarded which they preach publicly. At the great council of Congregationalists held last year in London, a layman boldly uttered these scathing words to ministers gathered from all parts of the world: "The rich pay the piper and they select the tune, and the preacher is the victim or servant of the rich diaconate, rather than the servant of the Master."* Of course, that charge is not indiscriminately true. If it is, good-by to all true church life; farewell

* Ben Tillett.

to the respect and confidence and love and following of recognized teachers in the church of Christ, such as is necessary, if they are to lead the world to God; gone is all bravery in the ministry. For in the words of another: "To do and say the right thing because it is right, to dare to gaze on the splendor of the naked truth without putting a veil before it to terrify any by mystery and vagueness,—to live by love and not by fear,—that is the life of a brave man who will take Christ and His mind for the truth, instead of the clamor either of the worldly world or of the religious world."* God save the clergy from cowardice! Amen! Phillips Brooks was right when he said: "These are no times for trimming. He is weak to-day who does not preach the highest spirituality to the materialist and the highest morality to the profligate. The unbelievers of to-day despise compromise, and love to hear the fullest truth." In the coming ideal church there will not be the slightest occasion for such a charge as Ben Tillett made, for her ministry will be sincere, brave, honest, realizing that

"One self-approving hour whole worlds outweighs
Of stupid starers and of loud huzzahs!"

they will not seek for so-called popularity, and the applause of crowds, so much as for the approval of God and conscience in doing right for right's sake.

4. And further, the ministry of the coming ideal church will be large-hearted and charitable. There will be in it no petty jealousy; no envyings; no scampering for the rich churches; no jostling and crowding one another in unkindness;—but a charitable feeling towards each other that is helpful and encouraging to all; and a rejoicing in the successes of one another. The "elder-brotherliness," as found in the parable of the Prodigal Son, of enviousness and uncharitableness of character and disposition will not be known in this ministry. For as men grow broader in heart and cultured in mind, the less are they inclined to envy and the sooner does jealousy depart. Jealousy is common only among small men. Truly great men are

* F. W. Robertson.

not envious of each other. In Grimm's *Life of Michael Angelo*,* we find a practical illustration of this. Calling attention to the contention and strife and jealousy among the disciples of Michael Angelo and of Raphael, Grimm writes: "Excellence forms an indestructible fellowship between those who possess it. All great ones, towering above the common multitude of mortals, feel themselves indissolubly united; their condition is too solitary for them not to seek each other at any price. Around the two men (Michael Angelo and Raphael) envy and jealousy may have vented themselves in intrigues; but in the high regions of *their* truest nature, each felt too keenly his own and the other's virtue; and separately as they remained outwardly considered, they yet stood close together, because nothing sufficiently exalted to divide them reached the heights to which they had attained." Thus, in the excellence of a large-heartedness, in the elevation of a broad charity, will the ministry of the coming church stand close together, separately though they may remain outwardly, and nothing sufficiently exalted to divide them will reach the heights to which they will attain.

Let us hear in conclusion what one taught directly by the Holy Spirit saith concerning and to the true minister: "Faithful is the saying, If a man seeketh the office of a bishop (overseer—ἐπισκοπῆς) he desireth a good work. The bishop therefore must be without reproach; the husband of one wife, temperate, sober-minded, orderly, given to hospitality, apt to teach; no brawler, no striker; but gentle, not contentious, no lover of money; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. . . . not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have good testimony from them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." † "I charge thee in the sight of God who quickeneth all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession, that thou keep the commandment without spot, without reproach,

* Vol. I, p. 351.

† 1 Tim. 3: 1-7, R. V.

until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in its own times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power eternal, Amen." *

God grant that the day may speedily come when the ideal Church of the future will be the blessedly real Church of all time; and I feel like writing that if on this earth of ours it can never be realized, then let us pray that the new heaven and the new earth may soon come, so that the angel may show unto God's people the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God; her light like unto a stone most precious, as it were a jasper stone clear as crystal . . . and I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it; for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it, and the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day (for there shall be no night there) and they shall bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it; and there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean or he that maketh an abomination and a lie; but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." † "He which testifieth these things saith: Yea, I come quickly, amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." ‡

* 1 Tim. 6: 13-16, R. V.

† Rev. 21: 9-11 and 22-27, R. V.

‡ Rev. 22: 20.

Denver, Colo.

VIII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE, AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

A SURE STONE.

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not."—St. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

SECTION I.

Judas.

If, when He first met "Simon the son of Jonas," Jesus thought of the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone," did these, its concluding words, sink deep into His heart? "and he that believeth" (in this living stone) "*shall not make haste*;"* or, "shall not be confounded;"† or, "shall not be put to shame."‡ This is now to be seen.

"Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him."

Never more keenly than when he made that bargain, and fulfilled that contract, did Judas feel that the Messiah was guiltless of any wrong whatever, and could boldly challenge His enemies—"Which of you convicteth me of sin?" And

* Isaiah, xxviii. 16.

† I Peter, ii. 6.

‡ R. V.—*Ibid.*

yet, strange as it may seem, Judas could not love this man. To him He was indeed "as a root out of dry ground," having "no form or comeliness," and "no beauty that he should desire him." He loved Him not, for the same reason that many hated Him. The spotless life of Jesus was a constant rebuke to them. And the Master knew that Judas loved Him not, and would betray Him, for when the disciples confessed Him as "the Holy One of God," He showed no sign of joy, but abruptly said, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" His spirit was heavy under the knowledge that Satan would prevail with Judas to sin against his conviction, and afterwards destroy himself, soul and body.

True, Judas regretted his act of betrayal when he found it would lead to the Messiah's death, but his sorrow was purely selfish. The remorse which God's wrath had kindled in his breast burnt fiercely, and drove him to the chief priests and elders for relief. Pity for "the innocent blood" would have led him to the hall of judgment there to "cast down the pieces of silver," and confess his guilt and the Master's innocence. Or, this being denied, it would have forced him to the feet of Jesus to bewail his crime and implore forgiveness, and Judas, even Judas, might have been saved. But the betrayer never sought Him who for three years had been his constant companion and friend, to show contrition, or to ask forgiveness. The gentle reproof, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" had been powerless to touch his stony heart with compassion for the man; and the conviction, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood," was equally powerless to draw his unbelieving soul to the Lord. And so, when his burden became greater than he could bear, he hurried to the partners of his crime to undo his sin, and restore "the price of blood." But, finding they had neither the power nor wish to absolve him, he rashly took his life into his own hands. That sole and silver cord by which his Master would have held him—the conviction of his perfect sinlessness—and by which He would have drawn him to Him—

self, Judas madly and wilfully severed, and rushed, as Satan urged him, to his own destruction. He loved not, and therefore he "believed" not, and was "confounded" and "made haste," and was "put to shame."

"It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the LORD thy God," was the answer of Jesus when Satan cunningly endeavored to make Him take His life into His own hands by presumptuously casting Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. "And all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come," was the firm resolve of the sorely tried Job when many times tempted by Satan to "curse God and die." Jesus had respect to the commandments of God, and would not belie the divinity within Him; and Job, though dismayed that the hand of the LORD was against him, could hold fast to his faith and his integrity. Judas had neither. He feared not God, nor regarded man. He was destitute of love and pity. Whilst he might not rank with Jesus nor with Job, he could not follow the Christ, like Peter, to His trial, nor like John into the judgment hall, nor even stand with His acquaintances "afar off." Not once did he place himself within sight of the Master, where His compassionate eyes might at least rest upon him—eyes which Judas knew were as forgiving as His blood was innocent, and which, had they beheld his anguish, might have commanded his tormentor, Though "he is a devil," he is also a man, and in the name of humanity I bid thee, "Let him go."

Instead of following the "Master" whom he had so officiously hailed and kissed—instead of placing himself within sight of Jesus, under whose eyes alone the sinner is safe, whether from the power of sin and Satan, or, what is still more fearful, the wrath of God, Judas took his doom upon himself and chose to "make haste." The eyes that could bring Peter to repentance with a look, and which might by a glance have forgiven him, he shunned; and the lips which prayed for His "betrayers and murderers," and might have prayed for him too, the chief of them all—the lips he had

once eagerly sought for betrayal—Judas never again desired to kiss, either in peace or penitence.

The Scripture says, "He went and hanged himself;" "and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." They recorded this last circumstance of his miserable end with as much precision as if it had been suggested by the fact that he had no pity, or "bowels of compassion," for the innocent and helpless Messiah, and received therefor the exact reward of his hardness of heart.

SECTION II.

Peter.

Peter, on the contrary, both believed in and loved the Master, and, though he forsook Him and fled when He was apprehended in the garden, yet, after the confusion of the moment had subsided, he turned and followed Him to the palace of the high priest. Here he stood "at the door," longing to enter, till John, who had also returned and followed Jesus, came out, and, by gaining him admittance, innocently led his friend into the very net of temptation; for this was the place where Satan had chosen to make his assault upon Simon. Desirous as much to wound and insult the Messiah, as to obtain possession of the chief disciple, he had maliciously determined that Peter should deny Him in His greatest extremity, and, if possible, before His face. This overthrow was not to be wrought in a corner. Publicly Simon had made his confession that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of the living God, and publicly he was, virtually, to retract it. And the means Satan employed to bring this about was, as has been seen, Simon's Jewish horror of the cross.

"To prison and to death" Peter had affirmed he was willing to follow the Lord, and this much had affirmed truly; for he was brave and devoted. In defence of Jesus he did not hesitate to strike the servant of the high priest, though making himself thereby amenable to the law; nor did he basely

flee at having wounded him by the stroke. He may have shrunk from physical suffering, (as who does not?) but he was not a coward. After Pentecost he went boldly to prison, and chained to the guards, slept there so soundly that it was necessary for "the angel of the Lord," who came with a shining light, to smite him on the side and lift him up. It is true that the word of Christ stood between him and *early* death (and death by crucifixion, as by that time he knew) but Herod was cruel. The whole church was praying for him "without ceasing," so imminent was his danger, and yet he slept so profoundly that his deliverer was obliged to bid him, "Arise up quickly!" and then, as for one who is but half awake, further direct him how to dress. Little was Peter quaking at the fact of actual imprisonment, and the prospect of cruel torture.

It was only when Jesus refused defence in the garden that all the disciples forsook Him, and then they fled because He surrendered, and perhaps because He had said, "Let these go their way." Simon was prepared to follow the Lord to the end, but he was also ready for active resistance, and not for tame submission. No more than the "multitude, who came out with staves and swords against him," did he expect to see the Messiah peacefully yielding at the outset, and His conduct in this respect was an enigma to him. He knew that Jesus was mortal, for he had seen Him suffer, and he knew that the Jews were desirous to kill Him; but he expected He would always avoid His enemies, or elude them by miracle, or perhaps allow His disciples to fight for Him. On death, then, for the sake of the Lord, or with their Lord, if unavoidable, Peter had counted and was ready, sword in hand.

But Simon had not counted on what, to his overwhelming surprise, he discovered a little later—that their Master's death was to be by crucifixion, and that on Jesus' part both the dying and the crucifying were to be voluntary! These possibilities had never entered into his reckoning. It is true the Messiah had hinted at them, but such hints he had accepted

as mere figures of speech, for crucifixion, alas ! was, unknown to himself, the very weakness of Peter's soul. Of all the disciples, and, next to Jesus Himself, he abhorred most the death by hanging. Stoning, beheading, burning—any martyr's death he could endure—but not the "hanging on a tree." That was not the death of a martyr, but of a traitor—a traitor to his country and his God—and hence the most infamous death a man could die. All the instincts of a true man and a proud heart rose against the thought of such a death ; and these instincts were Simon Bar-Jona's. A temptation like David's would never have prevailed with him ; nor could any bribe have bought him. "Silver and gold" were of little account to the man who scorned to "sell the gift of God for money ;" and just as little would the cry of "prison and death" have availed to make him deny the Lord ; but the shout of "*Crucify Him*," "*crucify Him*," Satan knew would be the death-knell to his constancy and courage ; and with this fear of crucifixion, he meant to, and did, cast him down from his height as the most exalted of the apostles.

SECTION III.

The Offence of the Cross.

To those who are born and reared in the Christian Church, the name "Jesus" is a household word, dearer than the name of father or mother, husband, wife or child ; and so the "cross" is equally revered. But with those who were born under the shadow of the tabernacle and temple it was very different. To the Jews "the cross," or as they called it, "the tree," was the synonym for all that was fearful to imagine and dreadful to experience. What made it so was, that "if a man had committed a sin worthy of death," and he was "put to death," according to the legal penalty, he was in some cases *after death* hung upon a tree. He not only died "without," or outside of "the camp," as typical of being cut off from the congregation of Israel, but his body was afterwards taken and

hung on a tree to signify that the whole man—body, soul and spirit—was “accursed of God.” There it was left till sunset, as a terror perhaps to like evil-doers, when it was taken down, lest it should defile the land; and then it was (like the body of Judas in the potter’s field) buried in unhallowed ground.

The Messiah’s case differed from this in many respects. He received His death *by* hanging on the cross, and not in some other way before. Being guiltless of blasphemy—the only show of a charge the Jews could bring against Him—they found it impossible to kill Him by stoning, which was their appointed death for that particular sin.* *Hanging* was indeed lawful with them, but it was only so *after* death,† *not before*. Hence they resorted to Roman law to gain their end. The Jews provided the innocent victim. The Gentiles furnished the illegal mode. Each was to be responsible for the crucifixion of “that just man,” who was thus to become the propitiation for their sins, and not of theirs only, but of “the whole world,” which was alike “guilty before God.” The Messiah was also, according to the law, removed before sunset, but He was taken reverently down and buried in consecrated ground. His body hallowed the land.

By the exposure on a tree of a criminal already dead, God signified that he was cursed by Him, and that men concurred in it; and only by Christ’s endurance of it could the curse be cancelled. It was the fruit of the forbidden tree that brought sin and death into the world, and cut man off from God; and until the tree had borne Fruit of quite another kind, of which the world might eat and live again, God had declared “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.”‡ The full knowledge and mystery of the Messiah’s death after this fashion, and as the atonement for the sins of mankind, had been carefully hidden from the church and the world, as had also been hidden the full mystery of His person, for both could only be re-

* Lev. xxiv. 16,
Crucifixion.

† Deut. xxi. 22, 23. Also Smith’s “Bible Dictionary,” Art.
‡ Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13.

vealed as they were accomplished in His actual advent and death. In this death, then, the Jews saw no salvation. To them it was "outer darkness," and as such they justly dreaded it. This was the keen edge of David's sorrow, when "he cried with a loud voice," "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" for David's foreboding soul saw his rebellious and usurping son caught and held, through the judgment of God, by the branches of the fatal tree, as well as pierced by the cruel darts of Joab.

At the time of the Messiah's advent, suffering had also been significantly added to the "shame" of the tree, by its being formed in the shape of a *cross*. However, from a political point of view, its *infamy*, far more than its shame, which He "despised," and its suffering, which He "endured," bore down the loyal Son of David, and made Him sink under the burden of carrying His cross. He had been born the Hebrew of the Hebrews, and lived, as touching the law, blameless as to both its spirit and its letter. To the corrupt scribes and Pharisees, because they sat "in Moses' seat" he had shown respect, and taught His disciples to do the same. Of the existing government, He had said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;" and, to the high priest, with almost His last breath, He could answer, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing." To Him who was the only true scion of David and rightful heir to the Jewish throne, and who for His people's highest good had steadily refused His own crown, what grief it must have been to be tried as a rebel to authority, a destroyer of order, a seditious person and an insurrectionist, and in dying be mocked as a pretender and usurper! Well might He cry by the lips of the prophet, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the LORD hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."

SECTION IV.

Some Truth in the Accusation of the Jews.

This infamy was the more bitter to Christ, inasmuch as there was ultimate truth in the accusations which the Jews brought against Him. "This Jesus of Nazareth" had come to abolish the rites, or "change the customs which Moses delivered" them, as they complained, though neither He nor His first martyr, Stephen, told the people this in so many words, as the suborned false witnesses accused them both of doing. But this was a consequence which would necessarily flow from His teachings; and hence Jesus was silent when the high priest asked, "What is it which these witness against thee?" The Jews were quick reasoners, and they saw directly that Christ's spiritualizing of the law would render its rites unnecessary, and so they stirred up the common people against Him by laying before them that which would be the *result* of His teachings, as though He had really taught it, while this result, put into the mouths of the false witnesses naturally made them, when persisting in their accusations, disagree as to the precise form of His words. That same spiritualizing of the law, St. Stephen, in his grand historical address, afterwards showed them was intended from the beginning, and destined to cover the whole world with its blessings, for which frank and fearless utterances he immediately received the crown of martyrdom.

Jesus of Nazareth did tell the woman of Samaria that the time was coming "when neither in that mountain nor yet at Jerusalem should men worship the Father" (with outward rites and ceremonies), but that the true worshippers should worship Him (everywhere) in "spirit and in truth." And He did intimate to the Jews that He had come to set aside their peculiar services of the law and predictions of the prophets; though at the same time He assured them, emphatically, it was to be done, not by destroying, but by fulfilling them.

The law and the prophets, however, the Jews did not wish to have fulfilled. The abolishing of the ceremonial law, particularly, would destroy their distinctive nationality; and against this destruction they labored hard, and to avoid it the high priest said it were better that one man should die for the people, than the whole nation perish. They were secretly angry with Jesus for saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." He who could speak thus was no true Son of David, and no true friend of the throne of David. Their government was slipping only too fast out of their hands; and it exasperated them to see the lineal descendant and acknowledged heir of David quietly submit to Roman usurpation. He was altogether too cosmopolitan for their plans, politically, as well as religiously. As a prophet who ought to know the hearts of all men, He compromised Himself by associating with publicans and sinners; and, as a Jew who should have regarded all outside of His own nation as "dogs" and "unbelievers," He offended them by His liberal opinions and world-wide sympathies. Therefore they condemned Him; and it was hard, as hard for Jesus as for any other man to be put to death for being in advance of the age. And more particularly trying was it for Him, because He had not, in this respect, a single follower who sympathized with Him, the apostles, even, looking only for the kingdom to be restored to "*Israel*."

He had come to restore the kingdom of God to the whole world! He, the second Adam, was to restore it to all mankind! and hence, as mortal, He had never called Himself "the Son of David," but only and always "the Son of man." It was a sore trial, then, for Jesus to be condemned on account of these things by good men like Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus, the teacher of Israel, who, for fear of the Jews, came to Him by night. For no doubt many earnest souls in the Sanhedrin, following the opinion of the high priest, gave their verdict against Jesus of Nazareth solely to preserve the nation. They were the guardians of the law, and

the upholders of the commonwealth, and a king who would not take his own throne, especially when the life of the nation was at stake, and he the sole living heir, was guilty of treason and worthy of death. Therefore they hung the Son of David, ostensibly as a rebel to the existing powers, who "said that he himself is Christ a king," but in reality as a contemner of, and a traitor to His own crown. This was the obloquy He died under politically; for the Messiah gave His people no reason for refusing the government which it was prophesied "should be upon his shoulder," except the incomprehensible one—"My kingdom is not of this world."

But this was not the deepest bitterness of His death. He was to die actively, as well as passively; was not only to "hold His peace," and "open not His mouth," but to assert, and confess, and testify, and in so doing give His enemies that power over His life which they could not otherwise obtain. By this testifying, the head of the Jewish church was to die condemned as a blasphemer of Jehovah by its unanimous voice. This testimony, which would have put honor on their temple, and, in closing its gates, have covered it with dignity and glory, caused Him to die away from that temple and its ritual, as a rejecter and destroyer of them: It cut Him off from the church, and sent Him outside of the gate and of the camp to die as an unholy thing on unholy ground, and the death, too, that was stamped with the concurring curse of God and man. He who had come for no other purpose than "to do the will of God," and who had done that will nobly and perfectly, died, before the eyes of all men, acknowledged by His own lips to be forsaken of God! In short, He died for the Gentiles, as well as for the Jews. But He has His reward. His name has become "great" among them, as He prophesied it should: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall

be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts." The name of Jesus, accursed by the Jews, is, by the Gentiles, elevated to that of Jehovah, and adored by them as the name of their Saviour and their God.

But, at the time, even those first and lesser contradictions were very bitter to Jesus, the innocent. Only "for the joy that was set before Him," the joy of becoming a Saviour for all mankind, could He endure that first humiliation, of which Peter, alone, was called personally, and as the representative of the church, to partake with the Lord. Of the second and infinitely weightier cross, that death of deaths—"the wrath of God" for all men's sins—none of the righteous but Jesus shall ever know.

SECTION V.

Simon Crucified.

Such was the cost, incalculable, at which the Lord ransomed the earth and the world. But that in this suffering there was any redemption, Simon Bar-Jona knew not. The significance and virtue of the Messiah's death upon the tree, had not yet been discovered by the Jews, though the thicket of shrubs had caught and held the ram that saved Isaac, and the tree thrown into the bitter waters of Marah had made them sweet and nourishing. The light of Heaven had not yet been shed upon the cross. From the church and the world its glory was hidden, and to Simon's sight, as to that of all others, only the curse of God hung over it, and the blackness of hell gathered round it. Just as there was no beauty in Jesus, that Judas "should desire him," so there was no attraction in His cross for Simon. This death was without hope. No joy was set before Peter to enable him to endure it, except the joy of dying thus with the Master, and for that his love was not strong enough. "The customs of Moses," the religion of the prophets, and the church of his fathers, were dearer to him than the man

whom he had confessed as the Christ and the Son of the living God. And, therefore, at each inquisitive and separate remark of the servants—

“Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee.”

“Art thou not also one of his disciples?”

“Did I not see thee in the garden with him?”—

Peter's heart sank lower and lower; for with each interrogation, Satan made him believe that by adhering to Jesus of Nazareth, this death would surely be his. He showed him (and crosses were many) that, as the chief disciple, he would certainly be crucified with Jesus, and die a recreant too, as He was dying an apostate from the faith of Israel; and of course Simon the Jew fell rapidly from the truth, and denied with all his strength that he knew “the man,” “Jesus which is called Christ.”

During that time of trial Peter endured an agony of fear and dread. The strongest expressions that can come from men in the extremity of torture burst from his lips; and he who probably had never sinned against the letter of the law, found, to his dismay, that when tried to the utmost he could lie, and curse and blaspheme. Truly the bodily labor of Simon the Cyrenian who, toiling, bore the weight of the wood on his back, when Jesus sank under His cross, was nothing to the labor in spirit of Simon the Galilean, when he bore the burden of it on his heart, and fell because of it! fell, as Jesus prophesied he would, when on referring to His own martyrdom by crucifixion He said, “*Whither* I go, thou canst not follow me *now*; but thou shalt follow me afterwards.”

This was indeed the death, like His own, upon the tree, so dreaded by them both, which the Messiah had appointed for Peter; but hasty in fear, as he was ardent in love, Simon rushed to the cross before he was called; and having neither strength nor grace to bear it, he died before his time. Had he but known it, or faith enough to see it, that last command in the garden, “Let these go their way,” was the Master's pledge to him that neither man nor woman nor child should harm him.

That was His divine, as "I have prayed for thee" was His human warrant, that not a hair of his head should be hurt. Had Peter held fast to the truth, without regard to consequences, he would have found, to his joy, after the trial was over, that he had not denied the Lord, and, to his amazement, that the storm had passed by and he was unhurt. Jesus had other work for him to do than die for Him then and there, and the maids and servants would have dropped him with a jeer; for only Satan and the Messiah knew the real value of his life to the infant church. Had he obeyed God, and refused at all hazards to "bear false witness," those great billows of fear, though they rolled over him, would have left him unharmed; but he "of little faith" forgot to cry, "Lord, save me," and this time he sank down, down under the waves, many fathoms deep.

But Simon also died that day to sin and self-righteousness. "He that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin," are his own words. From that place of trial he went forth another man. Sin had been exposed and crucified in him, and now the Messiah's promise to convert and make him a thorough Christian would be rapidly fulfilled, for henceforth Peter's motto was, "We must obey God rather than man." Though not in the sense he imagined, he had indeed died with the Lord.

SECTION VI.

Satan's Mistake.

The desire of the enemy had been gratified—to sift the soul of the first confessor as wheat. Keen-eyed Satan, to detect the weakness of Peter's heart, and quick-witted, to aim his blow at its most vulnerable point! Malicious devil, to draw him to the feet of Jesus and make him deny Him there! Foolish devil, to place him where by a glance from the Lord he could be rescued! to cut him off from any help of God or man, in the face of God *and* man, the true and only helper! Stupid Satan, to expose his prey just where he could lose it,

and that before his wish was half accomplished. For, no sooner had the words of Jesus been fulfilled, "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow twice, till thou hast denied me thrice," no sooner had the vital lesson (the conviction that he was a lost sinner by nature) been given and received, than "the cock crew the second time," and Peter was free, freed from the snare of Satan and the power of the devil. For Jesus, who was virtually nailed to the tree, the Serpent's ancient home and lurking place, and thus was neither in heaven nor on earth, but in "the Air," the only place where He could be killed--Jesus was at that moment striking His heaviest blow at the head of the serpent, whose power, He, with the aid of all His sons, was destined to crush and destroy. Where Peter denied, Jesus affirmed; where Peter swore falsely, Jesus swore truly; and Cephas the promised cornerstone was saved!—saved, not from falling, nor from being "broken to pieces," but from being ground to powder; and only saved because his Master accepted the death from which he had fled—died voluntarily the death of the tree—refused every other, but that over which was written "Accursed of God," and around which gathered the powers of hell.

To compel Simon Peter to deny the Lord, was only a part of Satan's design in asking for him, and the lesser part. The greater part of it was to force him to destroy himself. And for this the denial was to open the door, just as the betrayal by Judas had been the sure step to his self-destruction. "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Jesus prayed for him, and still Peter denied Him, and yet Jesus, God "heareth always." Consequently, to prevent the denial, was not what Jesus prayed for. *That* had been accepted and settled in the counsels of God for more than one obvious and vital reason; and therefore, after the last warning in the garden, "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation," Jesus spake no more to Peter by word, or sign, or glance (except to rebuke him for smiting the servant of the high priest) but, patiently

waiting, suffered the will of God to be done upon him. But having feared that at the climax of his trial Simon would be overcome by despair, and so he completely "confounded," "the Lord"—who alone knew, and had experienced, the depths of Satan's craftiness—"the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter," in order that he might not be driven by the tempter to further iniquity. "And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, *he wept.*"

The enemy of Jesus and His confessor, on the contrary, hoped that, when realizing the extent of his sin, Simon, like Judas, would "make haste" to destroy himself; for no more in his case than in Job's did he care for the command, "Spare his life." When soiled with the mire of sin, and chilled by the breath of despair, the devil expected Simon to become the ready victim of his fell intent. And so he undoubtedly would, had not "the Lord *turned and looked.*" These last two voluntary and deliberate acts of the Messiah (in addition to His praying for him) fully disclose that Simon's life was the ultimate object which Satan had in view when asking for him; and they also prove that, without them, he would have been lost, and that by them he was saved. He had now gone so far in the direction of Judas that he could not appeal for help to God, nor to Christ. The Master knew that His unhappy disciple was paralyzed, and, quick as the opportunity offered, He turned toward him, and the divine magnetism of His gaze causing Peter slowly to raise his head, their eyes met in that long and earnest look, which thrilled them when they first beheld each other. "And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out, and *wept bitterly.*"

In that second, searching look, the new life within him was reclaimed from death, and, with it, the slain consciousness of the Christian, feeble as it had been, was revived.

But this time other features were added to it. It was now marked with conviction of sin, repentance, and forgiveness. Simon was so far restored to the fellowship of the apostles, that he could again walk with them, and run with John to the grave of Jesus, at the startling news brought by the women that it was empty.

"And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter"—that is, the LORD eternal, whom Simon alone had confessed. *His* look broke the Serpent's fatal charm, thawed the stony horror of his victim, and sent the warm blood once more tingling through all his veins. *His* look provoked Simon's repentance, and bathed him in a flood of bitter tears; and those bitter tears made the son of Christ so distasteful to the monster that he recoiled in haste and left him. He left him, however, only to return again with another and a more subtle temptation, when his deliverer should have retired in person from the field; for of all these wondrous sons of man and God, who, he felt were coming against him into the world under the conduct of Jesus, who had proved Himself invincible, Satan feared and hated most the first-born—"Simon surnamed Peter."

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE GENESIS OF GENESIS: A Study of the Documentary Sources of the First Book of Moses in Accordance with the Results of Critical Science, illustrating the Presence of Bibles within the Bible. By Benjamin Wisner Bacon. With an Introduction by George F. Moore, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Hartford: The Student Publishing Company. 1892. Price, \$2.50.

What is meant by the Science of Higher Criticism? And what effect will the practical application of this Criticism to the Old Testament Scriptures have upon them and upon religious doctrine and faith? These are questions which at this time claim the attention not only of scholars, but of all intelligent and well-educated persons. To enable its readers to give a proper answer to these questions is the purpose of the volume before us. In its pages its author endeavors "to present to all classes of Bible students, in churches, in Sunday-schools, academies and other institutions of learning, as well as to the general public, that which might be expected to be gained from a course of lectures on the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch, if delivered on one of the recently endowed university foundations for instruction in Biblical literature."

The book itself consists of three parts. The First Part, which is introductory, treats, in a plain and perfectly intelligible manner, of Higher Criticism and the Science of Documentary Analysis, of the Science of Historical Criticism, and of the Documentary Theory of to-day. In the Second Part we have the text of Genesis in the Revised Version, presented in varieties of type to exhibit the theory of documentary sources; with notes explanatory of the phenomena of redaction, and critical marginal references. In the Third Part we are given the documents J, E and P separately restored in a revised translation, with textual emendations of good authority. Finally we have two Appendices, which are made up respectively of the great Flood interpolations and connected passages, placed in juxtaposition with a translation of their cuneiform parallels, and of Hebrew notes.

The work throughout has been prepared with great care. It is clear, accurate, scholarly and thorough. Those who would acquaint themselves with the true character of the Higher Criticism and would put themselves in a position to form their own judgment as to how this criticism will affect the religious thought and life of the future should its results come to be generally accepted, will find this work an exceedingly serviceable one. The thanks of all who are interested in Biblical studies and in the religious movements of the day are truly due to the author for its preparation, and to

the publishers for the admirable form in which they have given it to the reading public.

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD UPON THE EARTH, Considered in its Historical, Chronological and Geographical Relations. By Samuel J. Andrews, Author of "God's Revelations of Himself to Men." A New and Wholly Revised Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Price, \$2.50.

It does not enter into the design of this book to consider the authorship of the Gospels or to discuss their inspiration, nor to explain our Lord's discourses or parables, nor to inquire into the nature of his miraculous works. On the contrary it assumes that the Gospels are genuine historical documents and true statements of facts, and it deals with the life of the Lord on the earth in its chronological, topographical and historical relations only. It was first published just thirty years ago. It at once commanded the respect of scholars, and has retained it throughout all these years. During this time, however, much study has been devoted to the life of Christ, and much has been added to our knowledge of the Holy Land. In the present edition of the work, which is new and wholly revised, the facts brought to light by this study and by recent discoveries are all embodied, and thus its value has been greatly increased. In the form in which it is now given to the public, it indeed presents the results of the best scholarship down to the present time, and on this account merits special attention. It is a book which ought to have a place in the library of every minister and of every Sunday-school teacher. No other book with which we are acquainted so fully and yet so reverently sets forth the actual life of Jesus on earth, and so judiciously considers the various points concerning which there is an honest difference of opinion. For our part we should not like to be without it. For practical purposes we find it to be one of the very best of the many works on the Life of our Lord which during the last half century have been given to the public.

THE SERMON BIBLE: John iv.—Acts vi. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th St., near Broadway. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This volume of the Sermon Bible covers one of the most interesting and important portions of the New Testament Scriptures. The sketches of sermons which it contains are, accordingly, unusually instructive and suggestive. No one can read over them without being spiritually quickened and benefited, and ministers especially can scarcely help finding them of value to them. Those who have the preceding volumes of the series will, of course, want this also.

THE PREACHER AND HIS MODELS, The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1891. By the Rev. James Stalker, D.D., author of "Imago Christi," "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. 10th St., near Broadway. 1891. Price, \$1.50.

A volume of 284 pages, containing nine lectures and an appen-

dix. Some idea of the contents may be formed from the subjects of the separate lectures. 1. Introductory; 2. The Preacher as a Man of God; 3. The Preacher as a Patriot; 4. The Preacher as a Man of the Word; 5. The Preacher as a False Prophet; 6. The Preacher as a Man; 7. The Preacher as a Christian; 8. The Preacher as an Apostle; 9. The Preacher as a Thinker; 10. Appendix, An Ordination Charge.

The author is from Glasgow, Scotland, and he has succeeded, we think, in marking out a somewhat new and original course in treating the general subject, following, as he does, some of the most distinguished divines of the age. As models he takes the Prophets as the preachers of the Old Testament and the Apostles as those of the New Testament. Whilst he by no means undervalues intellectual qualifications as highly necessary for the preacher, yet he significantly places the preacher as a *thinker* last in the series, indicating that moral and spiritual qualifications and character take precedence in the list. We can heartily endorse the positions taken in each lecture, but we think the title of the third lecture may, perhaps, not be clearly apprehended. It is true that the great inspired preachers of the Old and New Testaments exhibited a glow of patriotism in their preaching, as did even our Lord Himself, but we think their patriotism was something different from what is understood by the word in the present day. It was not so much merely love of country and nation as such that moved them, as love of a special, chosen people who were called by the Lord to hand down the true religion and prepare the way for the coming of Christ. As regards love in the way of preference of any one nation—as, for example, Greece or Rome—over other nations, the Scriptures say very little. It has, indeed, been questioned whether what is now commonly understood by patriotism in this sense is recognized in the Scriptures as a virtue. We do not believe it is a virtue, but it involves an element of selfishness when compared with that divine charity which recognizes no lines of separation among nations, but goes forth equally to all mankind as brethren of one common family. The patriotism of the Jews did become affected by a certain selfishness which had to be eradicated before they could take in the promises to Gentile as well as to Jew. It was not merely as a nation, as such in the ordinary sense, that the prophets loved their people, but as the medium of preparing the way for sending the Gospel to all nations.

But whilst there may be some misapprehension here as to the title of the lecture, the author in his *treatment* makes the subject clear. The preacher must have reference in his preaching, not only to the individual, but also to those organic orders of the social economy in the bosom of which the individual lives and unfolds his life. Virtue and vice, as social organic factors, must be regarded. But these organic factors are common to every nation, and while the

preacher should have interest in them because they are features of his own nation's life, yet his interest should regard them mainly as belonging to the economy of the whole family of man. In this view patriotism becomes subordinate to the broader virtue of philanthropy. Want of space prevents our expressing more adequately our thoughts on this point, but we trust the reader will be able to catch our meaning. It is regard for the organic forces and factors of the social economy that the lecturer has mainly in mind here by the term patriotism. Yet we would find it difficult to substitute a better title to the lecture.

These lectures take rank with the courses of able lectures that have in former years been delivered before the Yale Divinity School, and they merit a wide circulation and careful reading. Such lectures must certainly be a great advantage to any Theological Seminary. In the absence of a pecuniary foundation, might not a course be delivered gratuitously before our own seminary by one or another of our preachers, and in this way suggest provision of a more extended character, by which eminent divines from other churches could be invited to give their services? Surely some of the Alumni of the seminary would be willing to return and give the benefit of their experience and study to the young men preparing for the ministry on the subject of Preaching the Gospel.

GOSPEL SINGERS AND THEIR SONGS. By F. D. Hemenway, D.D., and Charles U. Stewart, B.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 80 cents.

This volume is a neat and interesting manual of the leading hymns of the ancient, mediæval, and modern church. It does not aim to give anything like an exhaustive treatment of Hymnology, but merely some report of the leading hymns of the ages. For those who have not made hymnology anything of a study, this manual will be found highly interesting, especially in introducing them to the classic hymns that have come down to us in translations from the ancient and mediæval church. It will be interesting to such readers also to know when and by whom the leading modern hymns, sung so frequently in all the churches, were composed. The work is written in a pleasing manner, and the publishers have presented it in the best style of the printer's art, so that it will make a graceful addition to any library. It should be found especially in all Sunday-school libraries, as the information it gives can scarcely fail to be interesting and instructive to young persons. Considering the excellent style of the book it is offered at an unusually low price.

BIBLE MIRACLES AND MODERN THOUGHT. By Prof. L. T. Townsend, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 15 cents.

This is a little booklet of forty-eight pages. Its object is to vin-

dicating the Bible miracles and show their reasonableness over against the attacks of modern thought. First Prof. Townsend states the objections commonly made to the miracles of the Bible, and points out their inconclusiveness. He then seeks to defend the following propositions:

1. There is ample evidence that Bible miracles are probable, if they are possible.
2. There is conclusive evidence that Bible miracles actually were wrought, if they are possible.
3. There is overwhelming scientific evidence that Bible miracles are possible; therefore there is ample evidence that they are probable, and conclusive evidence that they actually were wrought.

His defense of these propositions is able and deserving of careful consideration. Whether it will carry conviction with it will depend on the moral and spiritual disposition of the reader. Dr. Townsend, however, shows conclusively, we think, that belief in the Bible miracles is not by any means irrational, but the very opposite.

THE STORY OF SODOM: A Biblical Episode. By W. C. Kitchin. Illustrated by W. P. Snyder. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranstons & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.50.

The author of this volume has projected a series of biblical tales of which this is the first. The object of all these tales will be to portray, by the creation of imaginary personages and occurrences, the social, religious and political physiognomy of the times to which they relate. The present story, as is indicated by its name, has to do with the days of Abraham. It is well written, and will be found quite interesting as well as instructive. It makes an attractive book that is admirably suited to the Sunday-school library, and that ought to find a ready place in it.

HOMILIES OF SCIENCE. By Dr. Paul Carus. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1892. Price, \$1.50.

The purpose which underlies these homilies, the author gives us to understand in the preface to his work, "is to preach an ethics that is based upon truth, and upon truth alone." Truth, moreover, he defines as "a correct statement of fact," and as accordingly "demonstrable by the usual methods of science." His definition of truth we hold to be altogether too narrow, but accepting it as correct, we even find that these homilies fail to be in harmony with the principle announced. Thus, for instance, in the very first of them, the statement is set forth that "interest in theological discussions is nowhere to be found, not even in churches." Now our readers generally, we feel persuaded, will agree with us that this is not "a correct statement of fact," and that therefore inferences based on it are not "based upon truth, and truth alone."

These homilies, however, notwithstanding their defects, are well

written and scholarly, and will be found interesting and instructive, as showing the character of the new religion which a materialistic science offers, instead of the old. "We have," according to it, "no transcendental God, no illusory Ghost-immortality, no freedom that stands in contradiction to the law of causation. But we have the immanent God of a moral law in nature, we have the immanent immortality of a continuance of our soul-life beyond death, and the moral freedom of responsibility for our actions." "It is not," we are told, "the belief in an immortalized ego that can conquer death, but it is the surrender of this ego and all its egotistic desires." "Death," we are further told, "came into the world as the brother of birth, and death became necessary when birth, with its rejuvenescent power, lifted organic life one step higher in its evolutionary career, so as to allow a constantly renewed progress." After reading these homilies we are more than ever before convinced that the new religion which they advocate can never give to men the strength and peace and joy which are given them by the old. Christianity is something far better and higher than science, and especially than science as presented in this volume.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR. By Edwin Cone Bissell, (Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (The Hartford Theological Seminary. 1891. Price, \$1.75.

It is not an easy task to write a Hebrew Grammar for beginners. He who would successfully accomplish the task must combine many and varied qualifications. It is not enough that he should himself have a thorough knowledge of the language; he must also possess good judgment to determine what to introduce and what to omit, what to place in the text and what in the notes; he must have the literary ability to state principles clearly yet compactly; he must be capable of giving his matter a logical arrangement, so that each statement, as it occurs, shall be intelligible by itself, without reference to what is to follow; he must present a progressive series of exercises in translation from Hebrew into English, and from English into Hebrew, such that when the student shall have finished the books he will have a sufficient vocabulary to read historical prose at sight. How far Dr. Bissell, a good Hebrew scholar and a successful teacher, has met these requirements can only be determined by the practical use of his text-book in the class-room. Our first impression is generally favorable, but we confess to a fear that the beginner may, here and there, find himself unnecessarily confused. It has grown, the author tells us, out of his experience, and in his hands it doubtless works well; but whether another teacher, equally competent, would meet with as much success is a question which can be answered only after a fair trial. We commend the work to those who prefer the old method of grammar to the modern inductive method.